

Dibona, Philip, 21641A.
 Boruff, Marilyn William, 21640A.
 Ashlin, Clarence Lynn, 21642A.
 Morgan, Fred Baxter, Jr., 21643A.
 Zinnemann, George, 21644A.
 Morris, Floyd Marvin, 21645A.
 Rhodes, Stanley, 21646A.
 Windsor, Noel Franklin, 21647A.
 Hedblom, Robert Edward, 21648A.
 Yearty, James Emmett, 26652A.
 Wood, Glen F., 21877A.
 Bodner, William Clark, 21878A.

Chaplain

Allman, John Hayes, 25633A.
 Johnson, Mervin Roy, 25735A.
 Jeffery, Francis Eugene, 26650A.
 Tinsley, Raymond Earl, 25736A.
 Bean, Curtis Monroe, 26752A.
 McIntyre, Thomas, 26651A.

Nurse

Vsetula, Josephine M., 21177W.
 Dunnum, Delores Ione, 21178W.
 Duplease, Margaret Louise, 21180W.
 Workman, Betty Jo, 21182W.
 Slater, Helen Marie, 22465W.

Medical Specialist

Rader, Marjorie Anne, 21199W.

Second Lieutenant to first lieutenant

Air Force

Ward, Kenneth Allan, 24640A.
 Sherrod, James William, 24631A.
 Johnson, James, 25378A.
 Herdrich, William Frank, 25377A.
 Ives, Russell Bradley, 25381A.
 Hoffman, Jack George, 25380A.
 Snodgrass, Richard Neil, 25379A.
 Trott, Allen Leroy, Jr., 24641A.
 Wilson, Noel Estel, Jr., 24644A.
 Tixier, Edward Lewis, 24645A.
 Campbell, Jesse William, 27851A.
 Wondrack, Walter Morgan, 24691A.
 Ringle, Robert Dolan, 27114A.
 Whitlatch, Wayne Edward, 25383A.
 Aiken, Donald William, 25395A.
 Newell, William Eugene, 25392A.
 Till, Arthur Norris, Jr., 25400A.
 Maddox, Charles Ray, 25397A.
 Glass, Edward Marshall, 25384A.
 McMahon, Emmett Joseph, 25399A.
 Brand, Jack, 25396A.
 Callahan, Daniel Bradford, 25388A.
 Robbins, Earl Clinton, Jr., 25386A.
 Sparrow, Frank Augustus, 25404A.
 Salisbury, Rex Charles, 25382A.
 McArn, Kenneth Hunter, 25385A.
 Taylor, Louis Nicholas, 25403A.
 Todd, Robert Edwin, 25393A.
 Rowe, Frank Alan, 25389A.
 Emigholz, Don Richard, 25401A.
 Knourek, Vernon George, 25405A.
 Custer, Brice Calhoun, 27121A.
 Twinting, William Theodore, 27119A.
 McNair, Billy Joe, 27118A.
 Lapham, Robert Grantham, 27116A.
 Lawson, Jerry Walter, 27120A.
 Pinckney, Lucian Whitaker, 27117A.
 Tilson, Philip Alan, 27857A.
 Ungerott, Donald Clare, 27853A.
 Lang, Richard Henry, 27858A.
 Doty, Charles Douglas, 27859A.
 Pearson, Donald Bruce, 27855A.
 Evans, William D., 27854A.
 Nabors, J. C., 27860A.
 Riddle, Robert Boyd, 24866A.
 Perry, Lincoln Adele, 24865A.
 Jackson, Howard Wordell, 24864A.
 Stebbins, Harold Frank, Jr., 27861A.
 Kent, Joseph Crockett, 27122A.
 Ball, Fred R., Jr., 27862A.
 Brown, Charles Lionel, 27863A.
 Smith, Elliott Platt, 24972A.
 Henderson, William John, 27864A.
 Luton, Gilbert Gene, 25424A.
 Bergschneider, Ethan Allen, 25406A.
 Renner, William David, 25426A.
 Leonard, Francis Donnelly, Jr., 25417A.
 Hellwege, Guy Frederick, 25409A.
 Murane, David Millard, 25437A.
 Boxhorn, Lawrence Clinton, 25413A.
 Herr, Charles Edgar, 25410A.

Mills, Russell Gerow, 25434A.
 McCreedy, James Norton, 25433A.
 Laney, Robert Harris, 25416A.
 Campbell, Charles Frederick, 25407A.
 Uhalt, Alfred Hunt, Jr., 25436A.
 May, Jimmy Glen, 25419A.
 Winkler, Serge Teycheney, 25423A.
 Jarrett, Walter Allen, 25415A.
 Olesen, Leo Eugene, 25442A.
 Love, Billy Clyde, 25412A.
 Seymour, Charles Dolph, 25427A.
 Knodel, Robert Milton, 25418A.
 Ohlinger, Kenneth Wilbur, 25441A.
 Dolezal, Robert Frank, 25422A.
 Muncey, Claude Alexander, 25432A.
 Plathe, James Donald, 25425A.
 Nunn, William Wesley, 25439A.
 Cummings, Jack, 25444A.
 Foley, James Montgomery, 25414A.
 Hamilton, John Smith, 25408A.
 Eby, David Robert, 25445A.
 Hinton, Edward Stephen, 25411A.
 Norman, Raymond Lewis, 25435A.
 Mead, Frank Fullagar, 3d, 27124A.
 Styer, Michael Edward, 27126A.
 Stech, James Francis, 27125A.
 Reynolds, Noel Ray, 27123A.
 Jepson, Frank Paul, 27865A.
 Kienzie, Robert C., 27877A.
 Snyder, Russell C., Jr., 27872A.
 MacDonald, George T., 27870A.
 Irwin, Charles Edward, 27878A.
 Noble, John W., 27874A.
 Dial, Ramon Crittenden, 27873A.
 Ballantyne, James, 3d, 27871A.
 Byrnes, Donn A., 27868A.
 Ligon, Carroll LeRoy, 27866A.
 Black, James A., 27867A.
 O'Brien, Frank J., 27875A.
 Sams, Tommy Lane, 27869A.
 Staley, Robert E., 27880A.
 Conk, Arvil G., 27879A.
 Mottley, Harry Edward, Jr., 25446A.

Medical Service

Williams, Benjamin H., 27856A.
 Parsons, Frank Raymond, Jr., 27539A.
 (NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, by Thy grace we have entered upon a new week affording us many opportunities to share in the glorious task of preserving and perpetuating our freedoms.

Grant that the heart and hands of our Nation, which have always been brave and strong in times of war, may be even more courageous and stronger in building a temple of peace whose foundation can never be destroyed.

In all our adventures and endeavors may we not look for the trophies and tributes which our fellow men may bestow upon us, but inspire us to prove worthy of someday receiving the crown of righteousness and the diadem of Thy praise.

May the great patriotic motive, which shall animate the plans and purposes of the Members of Congress, be that of serving their generation according to Thy holy will.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 5, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 157

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. VERA BUCHANAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 158

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-4.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed the Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, and the Senator from Michigan, Mr. POTTER, members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for the year 1956.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 285)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In this session no problem before the Congress demands more urgent attention than the paradox facing our farm families. Although agriculture is our basic industry, they find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity. For 5 years, their economy has declined. Unless corrected, these economic reversals are a direct threat to the well-being of all our people.

But more than prices and incomes are involved. In America, agriculture is more than an industry; it is a way of life. Throughout our history, the family farm has given strength and vitality to our entire social order. We must keep it healthy and vigorous.

Efforts toward this goal have been unremitting. Many new foundations of permanent value to all farm families have been laid in the past 3 years. Two years ago a new farm law was enacted, designed to gear agricultural production incentives to potential markets, thereby giving promise to our farm people of a stable and dependable future once the wartime inheritance of surpluses is removed from the farm economy. Loan programs have been substantially improved, enabling many more farmers to acquire family-sized farms and to improve their farms and homes. The benefits of social-security protection have been extended to farm families. The return of the Farm Credit Administration to farmer control; expansion of soil conservation assistance and rural electrification and telephone programs; increased funds for research and extension work; initiation of new programs to aid low-income farm families; adoption of tax provisions of benefit to farm people; increased storage facilities; upstream soil conservation programs; greatly expanded disposal activities for surplus farm products; strengthening our Department of Agriculture representation overseas in the interest of expanded markets—these and other advances have permanently reinforced the foundations of all agriculture.

Yet, beneficial though these advances are, persistent and critical farm problems require prompt congressional action in this session.

Remedies for these problems demand a clear understanding of their principal causes. These are:

First, production and market distortions, the result of wartime production incentives too long continued;

Second, current record livestock production and near-record crop harvests piled on top of previously accumulated carryovers;

Third, rising costs and high capital requirements.

In short, we have an oversupply of commodities which drives down prices as mounting costs force up from below. Thus is generated a severe price-cost squeeze from which our farm people, with the help of Government, must be relieved.

We must free the farm economy from distortions rooted in wartime needs and thus enable our people in agriculture to achieve prosperity; in so doing they will help carry the Nation's prosperity to still greater heights. The administration and the Congress must move together to achieve this goal.

The requirements are clear. New means are needed to reduce surpluses and to widen markets. Costs must be cut and production must be better balanced with prospective needs.

THE MAIN PROBLEM: THE SURPLUS

Of the many difficulties that aggravate the farm problem, mountainous

surpluses overshadow everything else. Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperatively needed in wartime but unmarketable in peacetime at the same prices and in the same quantity.

The plain fact is that wartime production incentives were too long continued.

During the past 3 years, there has been no lack of effort to get rid of surplus stocks. Disposal efforts have been diligent and vigorous. Vast quantities have been moved—much of them given away. In the past 3 years we have found outlets for commodities in a value of more than \$4 billion—far more than in any comparable period in recent history.

But these disposal efforts have not been able to keep pace with the problem. For each bushel-equivalent sold, $1\frac{1}{2}$ have replaced it in the stockpiles. Farmers, the intended beneficiaries of the support program, today find themselves in ever-growing danger from the mounting accumulations. Were it not for the Government's bulging stocks, farmers would be getting far more for their products today.

Other consequences of past farm programs have been no less damaging. Both at home and abroad, markets have been lost. Foreign farm production has been increased. American exports have declined. Foreign products have been attracted to our shores.

Steadily this chain of events has lengthened. Our farmers have had to submit to drastic acreage controls that hamper efficient farm management. Even these controls have been self-defeating, because acres diverted from price-supported crops have been planted to other crops. These crops have been thrown into surplus and their prices have declined. Today, almost without regard to the livestock or crop he produces, nearly every farmer is adversely affected by our surpluses. The whole process, for instance, has contributed to the present plight of hog producers.

When 3 years ago this administration assumed its responsibility in agriculture, work was begun immediately on what became the Agricultural Act of 1954. That act was developed and passed with bipartisan support, as all our agricultural legislation should be.

The 1954 law brought realism into the use of the essential tool of price supports. It applied the principle of price flexibility to help keep commodity supplies in balance with markets. That principle is sound and essential to a well-rounded farm program. For two reasons, the 1954 law has not yet been able to make its potential contribution to solving our farm troubles. First, the law began to take hold only with the harvests of 1955; it has not yet had the opportunity to be effective. Second, the operation of the new law is smothered under surpluses amassed by the old program.

The attack on the surplus must go forward in full recognition of the fact that farm products are not actually marketed when delivered to and held by the

Government. A Government warehouse is not a market. Even the most storable commodities cannot be added forever to Government granaries, nor can they be indefinitely held. Ultimately the stockpiles must be used.

It is unthinkable to destroy food. Instead, we must move these stocks into domestic consumption or dispose of them abroad. Neither route under present conditions offers the results often expected. Surpluses moved domestically almost always compete directly with crops farmers are trying to sell. Moved abroad in quantities large enough to remedy present difficulties, they would shatter world prices and trade, injure our friends, and undermine domestic prices as well.

To be sure, outlets for some of the surplus exist both at home and abroad. But experience has amply proved that neither the home nor foreign market can, under present conditions, readily absorb the tremendous stocks now depressing our agriculture.

Clearly new action is imperative. We must stop encouraging the production of surpluses. We must stop shifting acres from one crop to another, when such shifts result in new surpluses. Nor can crop problems be converted into millstones weighing down upon the producers of livestock.

Remedies are needed now, and it is up to the administration and the Congress to provide them swiftly. As we seek to go forward, we must not go back to old programs that have failed utterly to protect farm families.

I recommend, therefore, the following nine-point program. I urge the Congress to pass this program with maximum speed, for delay can only aggravate and multiply the difficulties already sorely harassing millions of our rural people.

1. THE SOIL BANK

Our most pressing need today is to work off our surpluses so that our basic program of 1954 can succeed in gearing production to prospective markets at fair prices. A three-pronged attack is needed.

First, future production of crops in greatest surplus must be adjusted both to the accumulated stocks and to the potential markets.

Second, producers of other crops and of livestock must be relieved of excessive production from acreage diverted from surplus crops.

Third, lands poorly suited to tillage, now producing unneeded crops and subject to excessive wind and water erosion, must be retired from cultivation.

These essential adjustments can all be hastened through a soil-bank program. I recommend a soil bank of two parts.

The first is designed to meet the immediate need to reduce the crops in greatest oversupply. It may be called the acreage-reserve program.

The second part is a long-range attack to achieve better land use and protect farmers and ranchers from the effects of production on acres already diverted. It may be called the conservation-reserve program.

A. THE ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

I recommend that the Congress consider a voluntary additional reduction in the acreage of certain crops which today are in serious surplus—wheat, cotton, corn, and rice.

In considering the application of this program to each of these crops, the Congress will wish to accord special attention to their distinctive problems—notably in the case of corn—as set forth later in this message.

I do not propose this program as a device to empty Government warehouses so they may be filled again. There is, therefore, a basic corollary to the acreage-reserve program: In future years we must avoid, as a plague, farm programs that would encourage the building-up of new price-depressing surpluses.

What I here propose is essentially a deferred-production plan. As a necessary part of the voluntary acreage reduction, it is essential to protect the farmer's income. It would be grossly unfair to require farmers to bear the full burdens of this readjustment. Just as other readjustments from war were shouldered in considerable part by the Nation as a whole, so should this.

In the case of wheat and cotton, for example, I look to a voluntary reduction equivalent to possibly one-fifth of the acreage otherwise permitted by allotments—perhaps 12 million acres of wheat and 3 million of cotton. It should be practical to include wheat already seeded if it is incorporated with the soil, as green manure, or by other accepted practices. This would make it possible for more farmers to enter the program immediately and thereby start at once to work down the surplus.

Administrative discretion is needed to assure that the rates of reduction in different areas are related to the supply and demand conditions for different grades and classes. The farmer's cooperation in this temporary program must not impair his historic acreage allotments. Rights of tenant farmers must be protected. I should expect the reduction in wheat and cotton plantings to continue for some 3 or 4 years, during which time these huge crop carryovers should decline to normal levels.

In return for their voluntary participation in the acreage reserve program cooperating farmers will be allocated certificates for commodities whose value will be based on the normal yields of the acres withheld in this reserve. I recommend that these certificates be made available to cooperating farmers through their county agricultural stabilization committees at normal harvesttime for each crop. The certificates will be negotiable so farmers can convert them to cash. They will be redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corporation in cash, or in kind at specified rates.

I further recommend that the legislation provide that each participating farmer contract to refrain from cropping or grazing any land he puts in the acreage reserve.

By so reducing crop production, commodities now in Government ownership can be used to supply market needs up to a proportionate amount. Thus the bulging Commodity Credit Corporation

stocks can be correspondingly worked down without depressing current market prices.

The program will operate in this way: A farmer, with an allotment of 100 acres of wheat, for example, may choose to plant only 80 acres and put the remaining 20 in the acreage reserve. His acreage allotment will not be affected. He will agree not to graze or harvest any crop from the 20 acres put into the reserve.

In return for this cooperation in the temporary acreage reduction program, he will receive a cashable certificate. The certificate will be equal to a percentage of the value of the crop he would have normally harvested from the 20 acres. This percentage will be set at an incentive level sufficiently high to assure success of the program.

This deferred production plan uses the surplus to reduce the surplus.

It will be financed with commodities already owned and paid for by the Government. Time and shrinkage, storage, and other costs are eroding away the present value of these stocks. Consequently, the real net cost to the Government—taking these and other facts into consideration—will be substantially less than the apparent cost in payments made on certificates.

I emphasize that this program is specifically intended to provide an income to farmers while the essential adjustment in stocks is being accomplished.

There are many virtues in the plan. It will help remove the crushing burden of surpluses, the essential precondition for the successful operation of a sound farm program.

It will reduce the massive and unproductive storage costs on Government holdings—costs that are running about a million dollars a day.

It will provide an element of insurance since farmers are assured income from the reserve acres even in a year of crop failure.

It will ease apprehension among our friends abroad over our surplus-disposal program.

It will harmonize agricultural production with peacetime markets.

B. THE CONSERVATION RESERVE

The second part of the soil bank—the conservation reserve program—affects both today's surpluses and tomorrow's needs of our growing population.

Under the pressures of war and the production incentives continued in post-war years, large areas have come into cultivation which wise land use and sound conservation would have reserved to forage and trees.

In greater or lesser degree this problem exists throughout the Nation. Continued cropping of these lands results, on the one hand, in wastage of soil and water resources, and on the other, in production of commodities now in surplus.

Today the Nation does not need these acres in harvested crops.

We cannot accurately predict our country's food needs in the years ahead, except that they will steadily increase. We do know, however, that the sound course both for today and tomorrow is wisely to safeguard our precious herit-

age of food-producing resources so we may hand on an enriched legacy to future generations. The conservation reserve program will contribute materially to that end.

Further, production from the acres today diverted from surplus crops is now seriously affecting other segments of our agriculture. The acreage of feed grains, notably oats, barley and grain sorghums, has been increased. The end product of this diversion has been greatly enlarged supplies of and lower prices for hogs, cattle, and dairy and poultry products. Producers of fruit, vegetables, and other crops have been adversely affected. The proposed conservation reserve can also make a major contribution to solving this problem of diverted acres.

I propose that farmers be asked to contract voluntarily with the Government to shift into forage, trees, and water storage cultivated lands most needing conservation measures. Any farmer would be eligible to participate in this program regardless of the crop he produces or the area where his farm is located. I would hope that some 25 million acres would be brought into the conservation reserve.

Forest lands under good management are a constant and a renewable resource. One-third of our forest area is in farm woodlands. From this source can come a large share of the lumber, pulpwood, and other forest products to meet the growing needs of our expanding economy. The conservation reserve can mean productive and protective tree cover for less productive lands now used for cultivated crops.

The Government itself must encourage this transfer in order to achieve the advantages to the general welfare that will follow from improved resource use. I propose, therefore, that the Government pay a fair share of the costs of establishing the conservation use, up to a specified per acre maximum that will vary by regions. The Government's share will be sufficiently high to encourage broad participation and thus assure the success of the program. Further, as the farmer reorganizes his farm along these soil-conserving lines, I recommend that the Government provide certain annual payments for a period of years related to the length of time needed to establish the new use of the land. The Congress will need to develop the basis and procedures for determining the amount of the payments. Here, as in the acreage-reserve program, I would not let the farmer's cooperation impair his historic acreage allotments.

The farmer, in turn, will agree that the acres put into this conservation reserve will be in addition to any land that he may put into the acreage reserve, and will represent a reduction in cropland cultivated. He will agree to carry out sound soil and water conservation on these acres, and to refrain from returning them to crop production, and from grazing them for a specified period.

I urge the Congress to approve this program with the least possible delay so that a significant part of the desired

25 million acres can come into the program in 1956.

My estimate is that if the Congress acts in time, some 350 million dollars will be invested in the conservation reserve during the calendar year 1956, and a total of about a billion dollars over the next 3 years. Sums expended under this program will be in addition to the 250 million dollars provided for the agricultural-conservation program for the coming fiscal year.

In return the conservation-reverse program will bring these large rewards:

It will result in improved use of soil and water resources for the benefit of this and future generations.

It will increase our supply of much-needed farm-grown forest products.

It will help hold rain and snow where they fall and make possible more ponds and reservoirs on the farm.

It will reduce the undue stimulus to livestock production, and consequent low livestock prices, induced by feed-grain production on diverted acres.

It will similarly provide protection for producers of the many small-acreage crops whose markets are threatened by even a few diverted acres.

In combination with the acreage-reverse program for crops in surplus, the conservation-reserve program will help during the next several years to reduce the total volume of farm production and improve the balance among different farm commodities, both of which are important to a general improvement in farm prices.

2. SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Production adjustments effected by the soil bank are needed to halt current additions to surpluses, and to reduce stocks on hand. But additional relief must be obtained from the price-depressing influence of these huge carryovers. In Public Law 480 the Congress has provided basic legislation for this purpose. The problem still exists, but not for lack of vigorous efforts to deal with it.

Surplus disposals have permitted substantial reductions in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of butter, dried milk, cottonseed oil and meal, flaxseed and linseed oil, and seeds. Surplus disposals by the Commodity Credit Corporation have risen from just over half a billion dollars in fiscal 1953 to more than 1.4 billion dollars in fiscal 1954, and to more than 2.1 billion dollars in fiscal 1955.

In the last fiscal year sales of Government-owned price-supported commodities into the domestic market reached 403 million dollars. These were made with due care for the adverse effect they might have on prices received by farmers for current sales. Domestic donations to supply food for needy persons totaled an additional 196 million dollars. Overseas disposals, through barter and donations for constructive purposes, totaled 1.1 billion dollars. In spite of these vigorous efforts, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in price-supported commodities increased by about 1 billion dollars during the fiscal year.

Because the problem continues to be so serious and stubborn, the Secretary of Agriculture is appointing an Agricultural Surplus Disposal Administrator

who will report directly to the Secretary. The duties of the Administrator will relate to all activities of the Department associated with the utilization of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and of our current abundant production.

Expanded opportunities will be sought to barter agricultural products, which deteriorate and are costly to store, for increased quantities of nonperishable strategic materials. Additional legislation may be needed in this field.

The bulk of price-supported commodities held by the Government cannot now by law be sold into the domestic market except at prices equal to at least 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charges. This restriction has worked to the disadvantage of both farmers and the Government by blocking sales that would clearly have been advantageous to both. I recommend legislation to permit, under proper safeguards, sales at not less than support levels plus carrying charges.

Present provisions of surplus disposal legislation permit export dispositions of Government stocks to friendly nations only. Opportunities clearly to our interest may develop in the future to sell to countries excluded by this legislation. To enable us to realize on such opportunities I recommend repeal of section 304 of Public Law 480.

3. STRENGTHENING COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Our frontal attack on the problems of surpluses, diverted acres, unbalanced production and unwise land use is carried in major part by the soil bank through the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

These proposals are wholly in keeping with the fundamental principles of sound farm policy set forth in my special agricultural message of 2 years ago. In keeping with these principles the administration:

(a) Whenever possible will continue to ease or eliminate controls over farmers; and

(b) For commodities on which price supports are discretionary, will continue to support these prices at the highest levels possible without accumulating new price-depressing surpluses.

In keeping with this latter principle, I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that, as a direct result of operation of various parts of our present farm program, the supply and demand conditions for soybeans and flaxseed are now such as to warrant an increase in the price support levels for these crops in 1956. The higher support levels will be announced shortly.

In respect to other commodity programs I submit the following specific suggestions.

A. CORN

In recent years many farmers have chosen not to observe acreage allotments on corn. Considerably less than half of the 1955 crop was raised within acreage allotment limitations and thus eligible for price support. It is apparent that price supports alone, even at levels closely approaching the legal maximum, are an insufficient inducement for participation in a corn acreage allotment program.

I recommend therefore that the Congress give serious consideration to adapting the acreage reserve program to corn. One grave difficulty must be overcome. Unlike wheat and cotton, most of the corn crop is fed on the farms where it is produced. For this reason, marketing quotas such as are used on wheat and cotton are not feasible.

Thus, broad and effective participation by corn producers in an average allotment program is imperative for the acreage reserve program to achieve its objective of reducing the corn surplus. With broad and effective participation, in both programs, the acreage reserve program for corn would (a) reduce the carryover stocks which currently depress the market, (b) make possible a higher level of price support than would otherwise prevail for the 1956 crop, and (c) reduce the incentive to farmers to produce excessive supplies of hogs and fed cattle.

If the Congress should choose not to authorize the acreage reserve program for corn, the Congress may wish to consider an alternative; to eliminate acreage allotments for corn and put price supports for corn on a discretionary basis comparable with the other feed grains. With no acreage allotments and with discretionary supports, all corn producers would be eligible for price supports at a level substantially above the market price which prevailed during the 1955 harvest.

B. WHEAT

The problems of wheat are difficult and complex. The proposed soil bank, with its acreage reserve program, will make a major contribution toward their solution. This program is particularly well-suited to wheat since this crop is grown in large acreage and is now burdened under an accumulated carryover in excess of a full year's needs. The conservation reserve program and the Great Plains program, described later, will also help. Other changes are necessary also, both for current adjustments and for long-term balance between production and consumption.

(a) Legislation already has passed the Senate and is pending in the House of Representatives which would exempt from marketing quotas those producers who use for feed, food, or seed on their own farms all the wheat they raise. Because of the failure to pass this legislation last year, the Department of Agriculture has been compelled by law to hale before the courts farmers whose only offense was to raise and feed wheat outside their quotas. Again the administration urges prompt enactment of this legislation. Correction of this problem should be delayed no longer.

(b) Historically a significant proportion of the annual wheat crop has been used for livestock feed. The quantity fed in pre-World War II years ranged from 100 to 150 million bushels a year, about twice the quantity fed in more recent years. This reduced consumption has aggravated the surplus burden.

I recommend that the Congress give consideration to authorizing the annual sale for feeding purposes, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, of limited quantities of Commodity Credit

Corporation wheat of less desirable milling quality. The authorized sale price should reflect the feeding value of the wheat, precautions being exercised as to the effect of such sales on prices on other feed grains. There are opportunities to use more wheat for feed in feed-deficit areas distant from the Corn Belt.

(c) I recommend legislation to expand the noncommercial wheat area beyond the 12 States now so designated. This action would eliminate acreage and marketing controls for many farmers who characteristically feed on their own farms most of the wheat they raise, and who contribute little to commercial supplies or surplus stocks.

(d) I recommend extension for 1 year of legislation which exempts durum wheat from acreage and marketing controls. This type of wheat is in short supply and production should not be restricted.

We are participating in negotiations for possible renewal of the International Wheat Agreement, which will terminate July 1, 1956, unless it is renewed.

C. COTTON

As in the case of wheat, the acreage reserve program is especially well-suited to cotton. This crop as well is burdened by an accumulated carryover in excess of a full year's requirements. Other legislative changes for cotton, in addition to the soil bank program, that require consideration are these:

(a) For all crops except cotton, price-support legislation requires that parity prices shall be computed on the basis of the average grade and quality of the crop. For cotton a special provision of law designates middling $\frac{7}{8}$ -inch cotton as the standard grade for parity calculations and price support. Currently less than 5 percent of cotton production is of this grade or lower.

I urge an amendment to provide for cotton, as for other crops, that the average grade and quality of the crop be utilized for parity-price computations. This recommendation is, in general terms, in keeping with the intent of legislation already pending before the Senate.

(b) The shortcomings of acreage allotments as a means of controlling production on cotton are evident. In 1955, on an acreage allotment calculated to yield 10 million bales of cotton, nearly 15 million were harvested. Rapidly advancing technology is resulting in production far outrunning expectations based on acreage alone. This is especially true when prices are supported at wartime production incentive levels.

When production controls must be applied as a result of supply and market conditions, it is imperative to have controls that are effective. As surpluses are reduced through the proposed acreage reserve program of the soil bank and through other means, new accumulations of surplus must definitely be avoided.

For these reasons the Congress should consider replacing acreage allotments on cotton with quantity allotments beginning with the crop of 1957. The Congress could well consider similar action for other crops under marketing quotas.

D. RICE

Under the law, accumulated supplies of rice have required a 40-percent reduction in acreage for 1956 compared with 1954, and a decline in the support level to 75 percent of parity.

Rice production in this country is the most efficient in the world. However, our rice is rapidly being priced out of world markets and is being diverted into Government warehouses and even into the feed markets.

There are two alternative courses of action to which the Congress should give consideration:

1. Inclusion of rice in the acreage reserve program. This will require continuation of production controls and marketing quotas.

2. Elimination of existing production and marketing controls on rice. Prices could then be supported on a discretionary basis at levels which would permit rice producers to improve their competitive market position.

If the Congress considers the latter course to serve the long-term best interest of rice producers, it may wish to consider use of the acreage reserve program to make the transition.

E. PEANUTS

The peanut price-stabilization program has experienced serious difficulties stemming in part from a fixed national minimum peanut acreage. With improving technology this minimum acreage will normally produce more peanuts than the market will absorb at the support price. Consequently, I recommend elimination of provisions for the minimum national acreage allotment.

F. SUGAR

The legislation to renew the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, should promptly be completed. The Congress is aware of the need to give producers, as well as foreign suppliers and the entire sugar industry, as much advance notice as possible in planning their operations.

G. SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

The special school milk program provided for in the Agricultural Act of 1954 has met with gratifying success. Approximately 9 million children had the health benefits of this program last year, including children in some 7,000 schools in which milk was not previously served. Consumption was increased by over 450 million half pints of milk. This is a good example of constructive use of a surplus product to meet a present need. We thus contribute to better health habits and at the same time promote an enlarged market for the future. Several thousand additional schools are participating in the program in the current school year.

I have been advised that, in some States, milk program funds are nearing depletion. We must see to it that the program is carried forward intact through this fiscal year.

I recommend that the program be extended for 2 years beyond June 30, 1956, with authorization to use Commodity Credit Corporation funds increased from 50 million dollars a year to 75 million dollars.

H. LIVESTOCK

For livestock producers, many parts of the program I have already discussed have special significance.

Establishment of the soil bank will alleviate the undue stimulus to livestock production and the resulting downward pressure on livestock prices which arise from using for feed-grain production much of the acreage already diverted from wheat and cotton. Restrictions against grazing the soil bank acres will safeguard the interests of beef producers and dairymen.

Periodically livestock markets become glutted and prices disrupted. In such periods, where assistance will be constructive, timely and vigorous Government purchase and diversion programs are essential to bolster prices and help producers adjust to market demands. Such programs have been undertaken by this administration. The pork purchase program now in progress will shortly be stepped up to supply new and expanded outlets now being developed. Sales promotion and the development of better merchandising methods cooperatively with the livestock trade are part of this effort to meet the impact of heavy marketing.

Special programs of an emergency nature will be provided to help livestock producers as needed. For example, emergency credit and low-cost feed in the event of drought will be available whenever disaster strikes.

Increased research on nutrition, disease control, better breeding, more profitable use of byproducts and improved marketing will help lower production costs and facilitate the smooth flow of livestock products into consumption.

4. DOLLAR LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORTS

The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reason of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

Under the price-support machinery as it has been functioning, price-support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture.

I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

5. RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In my message of January 11, 1954, I pointed out that the chief beneficiaries of our farm programs have been the 2 million larger, more productive farm units. Production on nearly 3 million other farms is so limited that the families thereon benefit only in small de-

gree from the types of programs that heretofore have dominated our activities.

On April 26, 1955, I transmitted to the Congress recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture for attacking the problems of low-income farm families. The Congress has met only in part these recommendations for legislation and appropriations. Despite the resultant handicaps, the interest in this program has been so great that pilot work is already under way in well over 30 counties widely spread throughout the United States. There is activity now in more than one-half of the States.

Four Departments of the Federal Government—Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture—are actively at work on this program with State and local leadership to aid low-income farm families.

Not only the welfare of these families but also of the people as a whole require that this program go forward. Once again, therefore, I urge the Congress to enact the full program recommended in my message of April 26, 1955.

6. THE GREAT PLAINS PROGRAM

Between the prairies of the Central West and the Rocky Mountains is a vast area embracing all or part of 10 States, in which erratic climate, wind and water erosion, and special problems of land use constitute a continuing hazard. For more than a year intensive new studies of conditions and problems peculiar to this Great Plains region have been in progress. The work has been carried on cooperatively between the leadership of the 10 States involved, the Department of Agriculture and the Great Plains Council, which includes technical people from the States of the region. This study will help to define the respective responsibilities of individuals and local, State, and Federal agencies.

The proposed soil bank, with its acreage-reserve program to reduce promptly production of crops in surplus and with its conservation reserve program to take less productive lands out of crops, will meet in part some of the conditions especially serious in the Great Plains. Other desirable modifications of existing legislation include:

1. Provision for longtime cost-sharing commitments under the agricultural conservation program; and
2. Relaxation of planting requirements to maintain base acreage for wheat allotments.

Shortly I will transmit to the Congress a report containing certain recommendations for providing a more stable agriculture in this important region.

7. RESEARCH

Scientific research has been the means of fundamentally important developments both in agriculture and industry. It has resulted in improved quality, new and better techniques, new products, new markets, new high levels of material well-being for our people, and new horizons for our future. Most individual farmers are not in a position to carry on scientific investigations. Government has special responsibility in this area—and particularly is this the case since the benefits of research related to

agriculture are widely shared by all the people.

Not only can research provide for the material needs of future generations, but it also can contribute in many ways to the fuller utilization of our present abundance.

We must look for new uses of agricultural products that can contribute to human welfare, such as livestock by-products for medicinal purposes or such as coarse fibers for construction materials already have contributed.

We must find new markets, as we have for tallow in industry or as have followed upon the development of frozen and powdered juice concentrates.

We must find new crops offering such new opportunities and benefits as are exemplified by soybeans and sorghums.

We must further improve our marketing mechanism, as already has been done through refrigeration and new processing techniques, so that the benefits of our abundance may be still more widely distributed. Marketing margins have continued to increase, even while farm prices have been declining. Thus the farmer's share of the retail food dollar has shrunk appreciably. Retail prices have changed little, thereby impeding desired increases in consumption. We must find ways to lower costs of food distribution. Research is an effective way to help attain that important goal. The Secretary of Agriculture is actively engaged in an expanded inquiry directed toward reducing the costs of distribution.

Our basic scientific knowledge from which all practical applications of science are made is vitally important and must be expanded. This knowledge is essential also to continue the attack on the ravages of plant and animal pests and diseases. We cannot use or reap benefits from what we do not know. A major frontier of agriculture lies in our laboratories and experimental fields.

In the budget message, I will request the maximum increase in agricultural research funds that can be effectively used next year with the technical manpower and facilities available. This will be an increase of one-fourth, to a total of \$103 million.

8. CREDIT

In making the transition from war to peace, and similarly in making the investment adjustments associated with a dynamic agriculture, farmers are experiencing increased need for credit. This is especially true for young men, particularly veterans, who have started farming in recent years.

Private financial institutions, individuals, and Government agencies are furnishing credit for agriculture. Administrative, budgetary, and legislative changes now being developed in Government all point toward assuring adequate and sympathetic coverage of agricultural credit requirements, which cannot be met by private financial institutions.

Loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration have increased gradually during the past 4 years from \$212 million to well over \$300 million, and can increase further as the new provi-

sions for insured loans become more widely used.

The Farm Credit Administration has been reorganized to give farmers a greater voice in its operation. Further legislation will be proposed to combine the Production Credit Corporations and the Federal intermediate credit banks. Federal land-bank loans made by the Farm Credit Administration have increased from \$237 million 4 years ago to more than \$400 million last year.

The administration is determined to see to it that an adequate supply of credit remains readily available to our farmers at all times.

9. GASOLINE TAX

One of the farmer's operating costs is the Federal tax on gasoline. About one-half of the gasoline bought by farmers is used on the farm. I recommend that legislation be passed to relieve the farmer of the Federal tax on purchases of gasoline so used.

Historically agricultural policy in this country has sought to foster family-sized owner-operated farms. This has been a sound and wise policy—not only in the development of an efficient agriculture which has become the envy of the world, but also in fostering a sturdy, resourceful, self-reliant citizenry.

Farm organization and farming operations are undergoing profound change as science and technology rapidly alter the structure of agriculture. Great care must be exercised that these changes do not result in huge corporation farms on the one hand or in unrewarding subsistence units on the other. The time-proven commercial family farm must continue as the basic social and economic unit of agriculture. Accordingly farm policy must encourage such farms, sufficiently large and productive to provide satisfactions in farm living equal to those enjoyed by other Americans.

Insofar as the problems of agriculture can best be solved by Government action, Government should accept the responsibility.

The proper role of Government, however, is that of partner with the farmer—never his master. By every possible means we must develop and promote that partnership—to the end that agriculture may continue to be a sound, enduring foundation for our economy and that farm living may be a profitable and satisfying experience.

Assisted by experienced farm people both in and out of Government, I have been earnestly studying this problem for many months. I believe that the 9-point program, set forth in this message, building on our present program, meets the urgent needs of our farmers today and does so in a way consistent with our basic traditions. It offers no nostrums or panaceas. Our farm folk expect better of us than to deal in that kind of specious practice.

Farmers expect programs that are forward looking, economically sound and fair.

This program offers a workable approach to reducing the surpluses, bringing production and markets into balance at fair prices, and so raising the income and advancing the security of our farm families.

Should this program be enacted, its degree of success will be dependent upon the degree of farmer participation and upon a common determination to work together in ridding ourselves of burdensome surpluses. With such a spirit, this program will speed the transition to a stable, prosperous and free peacetime agriculture with a bright future.

Again I urge upon the Congress the need for swift legislative action on these recommendations, in the interest of our farm people, in the interest of every American citizen.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 9, 1956.

INTERFERENCE IN ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS IN GEORGIA

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, I and several of my colleagues made on the floor of the House the strongest possible protest to the action of the FBI in presuming to interfere in and thwart the administration of the criminal laws of the State of Georgia. The question at issue turned upon the question of whether or not Negroes were systematically excluded from the jury panels. I gave what information I had at the time about the situation in this respect in Cobb County. I did not, however, at that time have in my possession an editorial which appeared in the Marietta (Cobb County) Daily Journal on Sunday, January 1, 1956. This editorial is well reasoned and makes it perfectly clear that there was no earthly excuse for the interference by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Department of Justice with the administration of the criminal laws of the State of Georgia.

Consequently, I am including this statement herewith:

NEGROES SERVE ON OUR JURIES

Through an unfortunate series of coincidences, Cobb County seems to have become a temporary whipping boy for the Republican administration.

The Negro vote in several Northern key States can mean the difference between victory and defeat in a presidential election. The GOP is currently wooing that vote by kowtowing to the wishes of the NAACP as regards the Negro question.

Today, our Cobb jury system is under investigation by the United States Department of Justice. This probe originated in Washington as a result of the United States Supreme Court's decision in the Amos Reece rape case. We feel that the investigation has political overtones that smell to high heaven.

Undoubtedly there are counties in the South that still cling to the outmoded practice of excluding Negro citizens from jury service. Cobb County is not one of them.

For several years Negroes have served on Cobb County petit and grand juries. This newspaper has noted this fact with pictures of the Negro jurors and stories about their service.

We took justifiable pride in the knowledge that these Negroes became jurors through the efforts of local citizens and officials. No outsiders or Department of Justice agents ordered us to put Negroes on jury duty.

If one could examine our jury lists and distinguish the Negroes from the white (which is impossible unless you know the individuals by name), one would likely find a larger percentage of Negro jurors in comparison to Negro taxpayers than one might expect.

Cobb County has made great strides within the past few years to share the burden of jury service with our Negro citizens. This action was taken spontaneously, on the local level, without outside pressure or interference.

It is particularly galling, in the light of all this, to have Republican politicians cast a shadow on our administration of justice merely for political gain.

A column by the Alsop brothers which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, January 9, 1956, throws light on the methods used by Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, when it suits his political purposes, without regard for the persons or institutions slandered by his careless and unfounded charges and investigations.

I am including this article as part of this statement:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

DISGRACE ABOUNDING

The Japanese internment camp in Hong Kong was a fairly disagreeable place, in which public spirit was less common than the spirit of "devil take the hindmost." A small minority did the work of the community. The rest played the black market, or made a hobby of envy, or simply lost faith and abandoned hope.

In these circumstances, the small, determined, beaverlike man, who was to be seen busily trotting about on every work detail, was a not inconspicuous figure. He appeared to be, as indeed he was, dedicated to the public service. He was one of the real workers among the three hundred-odd Americans who were locked up in Stanley Camp along with more than 3,000 Britishers—the human refuse of a collapsed colonial society.

At gatherings of that dreary little camp's discussion group (which met in a patch of scrub under the shelter of the low pines to elude Japanese eyes) this brisk little man spoke up for a rather simple new deal view of the world. But he also showed far more sympathy for the problems of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek than the British colonial officials. And it was understandable, since he was an expert on the staff of the Generalissimo's Chinese Stabilization Board, on loan from the United States Treasury.

Such was William Henry Taylor when one of these reporters first encountered him in the grim winter of 1942. In Stanley Camp we had had our Communist agents—little, black-a-vised Izzie Epstein of the Sorge ring and his tall, blonde English mistress, who might have been very beautiful if she had ever washed. But they had escaped very early and with great bravery, one had to admit.

But poor Taylor stayed with the work detail until the Americans were exchanged. So when Taylor reentered the reporter's life some years ago, telephoning to ask for a letter to a loyalty board, it was easy to comply with his request. The reporter wrote that as far as he knew Mr. Taylor, the proceeding against him was a disgrace, not to Taylor, but to the Government of the United States.

It had been Taylor's bad luck to work in Harry Dexter White's department of the

Treasury. For this reason he had been denounced by Elizabeth Bentley as a Communist agent. Originally, in answer to a question about the persons who passed Treasury documents to her, Miss Bentley declared that sometimes "it was William Taylor."

Later, she revised, or at least diluted, her testimony to read that she had merely heard from Nathan Gregory Silvermaster that Taylor was a member of the Communist underground in the United States Government.

Because of Miss Bentley, Taylor was first visited by the FBI in 1947. Thereafter he was called before four successive grand juries. He made three appearances before congressional committees (twice McCarthy and once McCarran). In the end, in 1953, his case was taken up by the international organization's loyalty board.

He went before this rather special board because, in 1946, he had left the Treasury for a job with the International Monetary Fund. Two successive Secretaries of the Treasury, John Snyder and George M. Humphrey, urged the director of the fund, Ivar Rooth, to fire Taylor without further quibbling. But Dr. Rooth had an old-fashioned Scandinavian sense of fairness. He awaited the board's verdict.

Having begun hearings in the autumn of 1953, and having closed the case in December of that year, the Loyalty Board rather oddly waited until the spring of 1955 to hand down its first verdict. The Board then advised Dr. Rooth that Taylor had been an active Communist spy. But in order to convince Dr. Rooth the Board had to be much more specific about the charges against Taylor than the regulations had allowed when Taylor was on trial.

The Board Chairman, Henry S. Waldman, of Elizabeth, N. J., admitted as much to one of these reporters. Waldman explained that the first verdict against Taylor had revealed to Taylor's courageous lawyer, Byron Scott, what might be needed to prove Taylor's innocence. Taylor immediately applied for a rehearing. His request was granted. And now, only a little more than half a year after the first terrible verdict that he was an active and conscientious Communist spy, the same international organization's Loyalty Board has held that there "is no reasonable doubt" as to the loyalty of William Henry Taylor.

The courage and fairness of the Loyalty Board, in thus admitting its own hideous error, cannot be overpraised, but what about the testimony of Miss Bentley, who started the whole business? What about the Government preparation of the case against Taylor, which was a mass of smears and poison-pen letters, by the Loyalty Board's own final verdict?

And what about Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., who had the responsibility for the preparation of the Government case?

Brownell publicly renounced Taylor as a spy on the basis, apparently, of the cheap, trumped-up stuff that the Loyalty Board has now decisively thrown out of court. What has he to say now? These are questions that have to be answered if American justice means anything at all.

PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL MESSAGE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard read 14 pages, legal size

and single spaced, of a message from the President of the United States. It is quite different from the type of message we have received in the months and years gone by, regarding agriculture.

This 14-page message, Mr. Speaker, represents an admission on the part of the administration that its farm policies for the past 3 years have been an utter failure. It makes one other admission, that the administration is going all out to buy the American farmer in an election year.

The thing which has moved Benson into action is not the disastrous situation confronting farmers. Politics forced him to move.

This is a big election year. It was politically expedient for him to move and so he has moved. If he had his choosing he would stick with what we have and no more.

He and the President and their followers have been insisting for months and months that there was nothing wrong with agriculture. Time and again they have claimed that things were leveling off and that we were moving in the right direction. It was only after farm income reached depression levels under their leadership, plus an early approaching election day, that they have moved to act. They are trying to buy farmers off on an election year. But they will find out that the farmers cannot be bought.

So, of course, everyone, including the farmers, will view with suspicion their purposes and also their recommendations.

Farmers and all of us well remember their promises made 4 years ago. They talked about 100 percent of parity at the market place and a free agriculture. Under them things would be different. Indeed they were—and how. Their promises were promptly broken and re-broken again and again. In fact they were never thereafter considered. Controls are still with us and Benson has not until this good day, even in the present recommendations, sought the repeal of one single element of the controls on cotton, wheat, and some other basic crops.

No immediate relief can come from this program. It is too little and too late to be of help in 1956. Agriculture's immediate problem is surpluses. Immediate relief can come only from immediate disposition of the surpluses. Benson and the administration have ample authority to get rid of them but they refuse to act.

THE LATE MARTIN P. DURKIN

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Martin P. Durkin, a distinguished public servant and one of the Nation's most outstanding labor leaders, died on November 13, 1955. His passing is an

irreplaceable loss to the people, to the labor movement which he represented, and to his many friends.

Martin P. Durkin, for many years a resident of my district in Chicago's southwest side, was born in the back-of-the-yards district of Chicago on March 18, 1894, the son of Irish immigrants. From this neighborly district have come some of our greatest political leaders, our best industrial leaders, our most notable labor leaders. Martin P. Durkin occupies a lofty place among their ranks. His father was an ardent trade unionist who, during his early employment labored 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, for the meager earnings of \$2 a day. Martin Durkin attended grammar school at Visitation parochial school. Being the eldest of eight children, he was required to go to work after the eighth grade to help support his family. He became an apprentice steamfitter in 1917. While working at his trade, he attended night school to further his education.

He served in World War I, and, subsequent to his service in the Army, resumed work in his chosen trade and became increasingly active in union affairs. In 1921, he became assistant business manager of the Steamfitters Protective Union of Chicago, Local Union No. 597. During his tenure as assistant business manager of this local union, he increased his participation in civic affairs, serving upon many Chicago local municipal boards and commissions. He was elected vice president of the Chicago Building Trades Council in 1927.

In 1933, during the depths of the depression, Gov. Henry Horner appointed Martin Durkin director of labor of the State of Illinois. It was as a result of his efforts as director of labor of the State of Illinois that that department became a model of State departments of labor throughout the United States.

To Martin Durkin belongs a great deal of the credit for passage in Illinois of a minimum-wage law for women and children, an 8-hour law for women, a law establishing the public employment service and providing for unemployment insurance. He assisted in securing improvements to the State workmen's compensation law.

The late Governor of Illinois stated that Martin Durkin's appointment was the best he ever made. Mr. Durkin continued to serve as director of labor under Governor Stelle and Governor Green. Probably the best recognition of his stewardship as director of labor is typified by a story that is told in and about Chicago. As the story is related, Gov. Dwight Green a Republican, requested State labor officials to name three candidates whom they felt might be appropriate to succeed Martin Durkin, a Democrat. The officials of the State labor organizations replied with these names: First, Martin P. Durkin; second, Martin P. Durkin; and, third, Martin P. Durkin.

Subsequent to his tenure as director of labor, Martin Durkin was elected general secretary-treasurer and later president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry.

In addition to his union duties, during World War II, Martin Durkin was designated American Federation of Labor member of the National War Labor Board.

In 1953, Mr. Durkin accepted a request of President Eisenhower to become Secretary of Labor. His appointment as Secretary of Labor was considered by many who did not know him as a surprise because he had been noted throughout his life as an outspoken Democrat and had favored the President's opponent, Adlai E. Stevenson, in the prior election.

To those who knew Martin Durkin, his appointment as Secretary of Labor was the best Cabinet appointment the President has made. Martin Durkin's career as Secretary of Labor, though shortlived, was characterized and ended upon a question of principle to which he had adhered throughout his life. He explained his resignation simply as: "Adherence to an agreement was a matter of principle with me and I could not disregard my principles at this late date in my life."

A statement of the sterling qualities and characteristics of Martin P. Durkin is beyond the capacity of this speaker. However, it was eloquently and most beautifully portrayed in the sermon at the funeral of Martin P. Durkin by the Very Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins at the Church of the Little Flower in the district which I represent in Chicago, held on November 18, 1955.

With the permission of this House, I would like to quote this sermon:

SERMON AT THE FUNERAL OF MARTIN P. DURKIN BY VERY REV. MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS, CHURCH OF THE LITTLE FLOWER, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 18, 1955

"My son, do thy works in meekness, and thou shalt be beloved above the glory of men."

"The greater thou art, humble thyself the more in all things and thou shalt find grace before God."

"For great is the power of God alone, and He is honored by the humble." (Ecclesiasticus, III 19-21.)

Meekness is a word which is seldom used nowadays as a compliment except in the Lives of the Saints and in the literature of devotional or ascetical theology. The word has been drained of all its manly strength and vigor until today it is widely regarded as a synonym for weakness rather than 1 of the 7 Beatitudes to which our Lord Himself attached an infallible guarantee. "Blessed are the meek," He told us in His beautiful Sermon on the Mount, "for they shall possess the earth." I dare say that most of us find this difficult to understand. Blessed are the merciful—yes. Blessed are the clean of heart—yes. By the mercy of God, even the lecher in his heart of hearts and in his faltering moments of repentance knows this to be true. Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after justice. This, again, we can understand, to some extent at least, on the basis of our own experience.

But meekness is something else again. Somehow or other, meekness, as the word is commonly used in the vernacular, seems to suggest a certain lack of character. It brings to mind a Milquetoast, a likable weakling who is easily pushed around, or, an unlikable hypocrite like Dickens' Uriah Heep, who bows and scrapes to curry favor with his superiors whom, of course, he secretly despises.

We seldom, if ever, associate the quality of meekness with a man who has attained eminent success in the competitive rough-and-tumble world of business or labor or politics. These men are publicly esteemed as men of character and strong convictions who will brook no opposition when they are convinced that what they are doing is good for the cause. We hardly ever hear them characterized or described as being meek; for this would imply to many people that they were also weak—and a weak leader, of course, is almost a contradiction in terms.

Our good friend Martin Durkin was a notable exception to this rule. He was one of the strongest characters I have ever known, a man of extraordinary physical as well as moral courage, a man with an iron will and unusual tenacity of purpose, a man of dogged perseverance and persistence. And yet almost every major article that was written about Mr. Durkin during his brief term of public office in Washington paid him the richly deserved compliment of saying that he was preeminently a man who, in the words of Ecclesiastes, did his work in meekness. One of his biographers put it very well, indeed, when he said: "If I were pressed to say what I have learned from Martin Durkin, it would be that I think I understand a little more completely what the word 'meek' means, as used in the Bible. It doesn't mean groveling in your relations with others, or thinking yourself unworthy in comparison with them; perhaps it just means not thinking about yourself at all." Another biographer referred to Mr. Durkin as a man of great patience and profound calm. Still another said that he had never raised his voice in 30 years, to which he added, "except, of course, in prayer."

"Except, of course, in prayer." This little footnote was more than an incidental postscript or a casual afterthought. Constant prayer was the very center of Mr. Durkin's exemplary life, the secret of his sterling Christian character. It was the source of his many virtues—his meekness, his courage, his dogged devotion to duty, his never-failing courtesy, his extraordinary patience and his ability to "suffer fools gladly," his uncompromising sense of justice, his profound respect for women, his tender love of children, and, above all, his unassuming personal charity, the extent of which even his family and his closest friends can only roughly estimate.

Frequently during the past 15 years I had the privilege of spending a few hours with Mr. Durkin and his devoted family in the company of other priests. Some of those priests are here this morning for his final obsequies. They will bear me out when I say that we invariably came away from those little family gatherings saying to ourselves in all sincerity and with deep humility that there was a man who could put us all to shame when it came to personal prayer and the worship of Almighty God. He was truly an inspiration to all of us, and I like to think that by the grace of God we are better priests—more prayerful priests—for having been privileged to know him.

Many times in recent weeks during his lingering illness in Georgetown Hospital in Washington we have heard his lay associates say the same thing about the influence of his example upon their own lives. They were thinking of the fact that they never knew him to miss daily Mass and Communion even on the busiest day of the most hectic union convention. They were thinking of his frequent spiritual retreats. They were thinking, too, of the fact that they had never heard him say a word, either publicly or privately, which would have been embarrassing even to the most innocent child or offensive to the most refined and sensitive woman. Some of those who knew him longer than the rest of us were probably thinking that his patience and his meekness, his profound calm and self-pos-

session were the result of intensive self-discipline, the result of constant prayer and mortification—for, unless I am badly mistaken, his natural temperament was rather brusque and fiery. He had the strong face of a man who had had to struggle, with the help of God's grace, to learn the manly art of self-control. He learned it very well indeed.

Under ordinary circumstances it would be contrary to Catholic practice and tradition to eulogize the deceased in such effusive terms, but I think you will agree with me that these are not ordinary circumstances. Mr. Durkin was an extraordinary man, and deserves to be honored as such for the consolation of his family, to which he was so tenderly devoted, but, even more important, for the inspiration of his associates in the labor movement, which he loved more than anything else in the world with the exception of his God, his family, his country and his church. Maybe there is a better way of stating that. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that he loved the labor movement so much and served it so well for the better part of his life precisely because he regarded it as a necessary bulwark of the family and the flag and because he knew it to be the normal means of putting into practice in his working life the principles of justice and charity which were handed down to him by the church to which he was so passionately devoted.

It would be presumptuous on my part and completely superfluous to go into detail about Mr. Durkin's long and distinguished career in the American labor movement. The record speaks for itself and is known to everybody in this church. Suffice it to say that he brought to his work in the labor movement, in addition to a deep sense of justice, which, of course, is fundamental, a spirit of personal charity, which is equally important but for most of us, I should think, much more difficult to acquire and to put into practice. One of his biographers tells us, for example, that during the depression years in Chicago unemployed members of his local union would show up at his home every evening, silent, worried, depressed men. Mr. Durkin gave them more than encouragement. Out of his personal income he gave them food and the other necessities of life to tide them over the crisis. This was characteristic of the man.

The story of his personal charity during his 15 years in Washington is an inspiring legend. One of the reporters tells the story very simply:

"Years ago, Mr. Durkin decided, without saying much about it, always to keep some poor family under his wing. But it occurred to him merely to write a check, giving up only the cash and a moment out of his day, was an act without significance, so he buys food for his protegee family in person. Once a week he turns up at a Washington market and walks among the counters, thoughtfully assembling a basket of groceries. When his current poor family includes small children, he confers with his wife or daughters-in-law about what sort of baby food to buy. Collecting groceries for folks who need them is a pleasant occupation for Durkin, but collecting thanks is not. So when he has made up his bundle of groceries, he usually sends it over by one of his sons or a messenger. When one family graduates to solvency, through recovery from illness or a new job, he looks about for another family, sometimes asking a priest to scout one for him."

As well as I knew Mr. Durkin over a period of 15 years I have never heard him mention this weekly act of private charity, and I never would have known about it if the reporters hadn't ferreted out the story and publicized it so widely at the time of his appointment to the President's Cabinet.

I mention Mr. Durkin's personal charity to point a moral for his associates in the labor movement and for all of us who are con-

nected in any way with movements of social reform. Pope Pius XII reminds us in one of his recent statements that "The greatest temptation in an age that calls itself social—an age in which, besides the church, the State, the municipalities, and other public bodies are devoting themselves to so many social problems—is that when the poor man knocks on their door, people, including the faithful, may simply refer him to an agency, a social center or to some organization, in the belief that their personal obligation has already been fully satisfied by their contributions in taxes or in voluntary offerings to those institutions.

"Undoubtedly," the Holy Father continues, "the poor man will receive your help in this latter way. But often he counts also on you yourself, at least on a word of kindness and comfort from you. Your charity ought to resemble God's, who came in person to bring His help. This is the meaning of the message of Bethlehem."

The moral is obvious. Our charity "ought to resemble God's, who came in person to bring His help." This, it seems to me, is one of the lessons, one of the many lessons, we can learn from the example of our distinguished friend, Mr. Durkin, and one which is very timely. The personal approach, which has always characterized the greatest of our labor leaders—a Gompers, a Murray, a Green—is more important than ever before as we approach the long-awaited merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Labor unity can be and, in our opinion, will be good for the country and good for the cause of labor. On the other hand, honesty compels us to suggest that a unified labor movement could also be a detriment to the cause of labor if, because of its very size, its very bigness, it were to sacrifice the personal charity and personal concern, for the particular and peculiar needs and problems of individual men and women ought to go hand in hand with better organizational techniques and better legislation, which, of course, are also indispensable.

There is a further lesson to be learned from Mr. Durkin's granite-like integrity. He was a man of his word. He said what he meant and meant what he said. As a general rule, he said it very calmly and very gently, but when he had said it, you knew that he could not be persuaded or induced or frightened into going back on his word by any amount of pressure or flattery or cajolery even from his closest friends. There was a quality of fearlessness and quiet strength about the man which even the toughest gangsters must have learned to respect in the early days in Chicago when they were trying to capture his local union. At that time, as one of his friends has pointed out, he didn't get the least bit excited; he merely prayed a little harder.

We are back again to prayer—the key to Mr. Durkin's sterling Christian character and the explanation of his remarkable self-possession which revealed itself externally in a very warm and very friendly smile even when things were not to his liking. As one of the Catholic weeklies pointed out at the time of his resignation from the Cabinet, the remarkable self-possession of Mr. Durkin, always the calmest person in the political storms that raged around him, was the result of his application of religious principles to his whole life. This attitude, it was rightly suggested was epitomized to his response to the question of a reporter at the time of his resignation as to why he seemed so happy. "I'm always happy," Mr. Durkin quietly replied. Those who knew of his strong religious faith, the article concluded, will already understand the reason for his enigmatic contentment and happiness even amidst the most difficult circumstances.

This, of course, was an exaggeration. Mr. Durkin wasn't always happy, and thanks to his extraordinary deep religious faith, he knew that he was never meant to be perfectly happy in this vale of tears. Even as a little child, he learned from his God-fearing parents, who incidentally must have been the very salt of the earth, that God made him to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him with all his heart and soul in this life and to be happy with Him forever in the next. It was this sense of realism, grounded in supernatural faith in God and supernatural hope in a life of perfect happiness to come, which made it possible for Mr. Durkin to face up so calmly and with such manly courage to the inevitable fate which he must have known awaited him after his second operation. I am sure that I speak for all of you as well as for myself when I say that I hope and pray that you and I will be as well prepared for our own death as he was for his.

It was this same sense of realism which enabled Mr. Durkin to keep a sense of humor and to see things in perspective in the midst of his tireless efforts on behalf of social justice. It was this which made it possible for him to keep his feet on the ground. Pope Pius XII tells us in a recent allocution that men are obliged, as Christians, to take an active interest in social reform and social reconstruction. "However," he hastens to add, "man whom God created and redeemed cannot keep his feet on the ground without keeping his eyes raised toward God, toward the real end of human life, namely, union with God in heaven, where alone all order and all justice will definitely be achieved."

"Therefore," His Holiness concludes, "those men, who in thought or in action, give themselves completely to this world, or who even deny the existence of the heavenly home have no solid foundation even in this world, even though externally they may seem to have one or may themselves boast of their alleged realism."

Mr. Durkin was able to keep his feet on the ground because he always kept his eyes raised toward God, toward the real end of human life, namely, "union with God in Heaven, where alone all order and all justice will definitely be achieved." May his passing remind us that we, too, must give an accounting of our stewardship in the not too distant future, and may his example of unselfish and religiously motivated service to the cause of humanity be an inspiration to those of us who are left behind to carry on the work of social justice.

If Mr. Durkin could have read the manuscript of this sermon before it was delivered, he would have asked us to eliminate everything which we have said up to this point and to confine ourselves exclusively to an earnest appeal for your continued prayers for the repose of his immortal soul. He was very conscious of his faults and imperfections. His frequent recourse to the sacrament of penance was eloquent proof of the sincerity of his deep feeling of unworthiness and his lively sense of absolute dependence upon the infinite mercy of Almighty God. In his name, therefore, we ask you in conclusion to remember him constantly in your masses and prayers so that he may be summoned as soon as possible to the reward which God Himself has promised to those who do their works in meekness.

"My son, do thy works in meekness, and thou shalt be beloved above the glory of men. The greater thou art, humble thyself the more in all things and thou shalt find grace before God. For great is the power of God alone, and He is honored by the humble."

It is not for us to judge either the living or the dead, but surely we can say with full propriety that God was honored by this humble man and that we, his friends and associates, were privileged beyond our just deserts to have known him personally and to

have benefited from the example of his thoroughly Christian life. May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen.

Martin P. Durkin is survived by his wife, Anne H. MacNicholas Durkin, and his three sons, Martin B., William J., and John F. Durkin, to all of whom I extend my deepest sympathy.

I conclude my remarks with the prayer that the principles which guided Martin Durkin's life may now guide ours in legislating for the welfare of the people whom we represent.

TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 3, I introduced House Resolution 349, which provides for the appointment of a select committee of five members to conduct a study and investigation of traffic and highway safety. This committee is to recommend suitable legislation to achieve the desired objective.

About 6 weeks ago, a Baltimore inventor, Mr. Charles Adler, Jr., sent a telegram to the President proposing the creation of a new Cabinet post of Secretary of Traffic. It is because of my great concern about this urgent matter that I am introducing this measure. In drafting it, I was careful to provide that the rights of the States should not be infringed.

The alarming and appalling accident rate and death toll, with the consequent economic losses, constitute daily and constant proof of the need of Federal legislation. The solution of the problem may lie in the creation of an agency, rather than in the creation of a Cabinet or sub-Cabinet post, but under the circumstances immediate action must be taken.

Headlines all over the Nation tell a tale of road slaughter over the Christmas holidays. These headlines are a gruesome confirmation of the worst fears expressed by me 6 weeks ago.

Last year alone, there were nearly 10 million traffic accidents in our country. Every 25 seconds someone was injured; over 36,000 people were killed, over 1,250,000 were disabled beyond the day of the accident. Last year, traffic accidents alone cost over \$4.4 billion; the losses in wages came to a towering \$1.2 billion; the medical expenses hit \$100 million. The economic loss is truly staggering. Economic loss, however great, is secondary to loss of life and limb. A human life lost can never be replaced. Surgery and medicine, with all of their miracles and wonders, cannot make whole again the maimed and the crippled. The protection and the safety of human beings should be our first concern.

The stark tragedy wrought each day by the automobile is a national shame. The motor vehicle is an integral part in the life of each and every American family. It is a vehicle for commerce and

it is a vehicle for pleasure. It takes citizens to and from their daily tasks. Our Nation is truly a nation on wheels. The automobile is a vacation vehicle for many millions of Americans. It can be, and it ought to be, a boon. The tragedies that are occurring on our streets and highways every day of our lives are not necessary. I am convinced that the genius of America, concentrated on this problem under unified direction, can eliminate the death and hazard from our highways.

At the present time, traffic safety is the responsibility of many unrelated agencies at local, State, and National levels. Each agency, department, or bureau has a more or less limited interest or responsibility for some particular phase of traffic safety. And we know that there are many official and even nonofficial agencies which prepare statistics, marshal public opinion and develop programs of education for traffic safety. All of this is illustrative of the saying that, "That which is the business of everybody is the business of nobody." In other words, there must be some central coordinating agency with authority which can utilize and bring together the work and efforts of all of the fine, splendid officials—and volunteer agencies—now working in the field of traffic safety. I could cite a parallel instance in government. Each State—and many local governments—have pure food and drug sections. However, it was not until the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act, with its administrative and enforcement Agency, that protection of the citizen against impure and toxic foods, drugs, and substances was assured. Today, the Pure Food and Drug Agency of the Federal Government works closely with the State and local agencies for the protection and well-being of all our citizens.

Establishment of a Federal agency to cope with the problem of traffic safety need not, and will not, displace or interfere with States rights and local governments in their diverse efforts to cope with the problem. It will assure to them, however, cooperation, coordination, and sanction, where necessary, at Federal level, to accomplish that result which we all devoutly desire—minimum loss of life on the streets and highways of our Nation. It is obvious that all of our good wishes and intentions in establishment of the many and unrelated agencies in the field of traffic safety have been unable to cut down the slaughter of our citizens which is taking place daily on our streets and highways.

I do not believe that we can wait any longer. The President of the United States displayed his concern on this subject when he proclaimed an annual Safe-Driving Day. By his action he left no doubt but that there is a Federal concern and a role that the Federal Government ought to play in attempting to check the daily massacre of our citizens by motor vehicles plying our streets and highways. I do not believe that we can any longer afford to engage in wishful thinking and pious hopes. Affirmative action setting up an agency with authority and the power of

sanction is the only answer to this menace on the highways.

Therefore, I respectfully urge your support of House Resolution 349.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing 12 bills which embody further suggestions for the implementation of certain recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

The House may remember that on last July 13, at the time that I introduced the first 50 bills suggested for such fulfillment of the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, I stated that I was glad to take this action because of the continuous and signal interest of constituents of the 13th District of Illinois in both Hoover Commissions and, also, in their findings; and, because, as a former member of the Committee on Government Operations, all proposals and actions on executive and legislative reorganizations have consistently held my signal interest.

I would like to repeat today, however, what I then stated; that my introduction of these bills does not necessarily mean in every case, complete agreement either with the proposal or with the suggested implementation. In some instances, I, personally, may possibly find good reason for objection. These proposals, however, and the supporting legislation, merit the prompt and serious consideration of the Congress. I am accordingly introducing the measures—and shall continue to do so as others are prepared—in order that the proposed legislation may be placed before the appropriate committees for study and, in particular, be brought to the attention of every House Member.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ESTATE TAX INSURANCE

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill relating to life insurance taken out to cover estimated liability for the Federal estate tax.

The purpose of this bill is to permit an individual to anticipate his Federal estate tax by taking out a life insurance policy payable to the United States, the proceeds of which will not be considered as a part of the corpus of the estate.

An individual can indirectly accomplish this purpose under the present law by taking out a policy on the life of his child, with an agreement with the beneficiary of the policy that the proceeds of the policy will be used to pay the estate tax. This bill if enacted would permit

the taxpayer to do directly what he is now permitted to do indirectly.

Many estates are tied up in family owned corporations or businesses, and upon the death of the head of the family, the heirs are frequently at a loss to raise the necessary amount to pay the Federal estate tax unless they sell an interest in the family business or encumber the business with what might be a crippling debt.

The enactment of this legislation, in my opinion, will not deprive the Federal Government of any tax, but on the other hand will stimulate a lot of life insurance business from which the underwriters and companies will pay increased taxes into the Government.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT TUBMAN

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Liberia has been celebrating the third inauguration of William V. S. Tubman as President. The confidence expressed in him at the last election makes possible the continuation of an administration which appears to have more sincere desire to raise the standard of living of the Liberian people and greater capacity to do so than did earlier administrations. President Tubman has exceedingly difficult problems crying for solutions, problems which are far more complex than can be solved overnight. He will need to feel here in the United States we are sympathetic and understanding.

The people of Liberia are to be congratulated in the decision they made to make possible another tour of duty for their President.

The United States sent over a very fine group to represent this country at these celebrations. This fact alone will be of real assistance to Liberia, for they look to us in more ways than most Americans know, not the least of which is the approval of their efforts. It is with pleasure that I list the members of the United States delegation to the inauguration of President Tubman of Liberia:

The Honorable Richard L. Jones, United States Ambassador to Liberia, as personal representative of President Eisenhower and with the rank of Special Ambassador.

The Honorable Robert W. Upton, former United States Senator, as personal representative of President Eisenhower and with the rank of Special Ambassador.

Lt. Gen. Leon W. Johnson, commander, United States Continental Air Command, as special representative of the Secretary of Defense and Armed Forces of the United States.

Mrs. Jessie L. Vann, publisher of the Pittsburgh Courier.

Mr. Asa Timothy Spaulding, vice president of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Mr. Garfield I. Kass, Washington realtor.

Advisers to the delegation were: Mrs. Thomas W. Simons, counselor of the United States Embassy in Liberia. Brig. Gen. Harold H. Twitchell.

THE RULES OF THE GAME

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in every type of contest, friendly or otherwise, that we Americans engage in, there is a basic set of rules or procedures that govern the conditions under which the contest is run. Sometimes they are written—often they are established by custom, but they always exist. To challenge the rules under which the game is played is usually resorted to by the losing side to cover up or alibi for their loss.

I was amazed to read in the RECORD of last Thursday where one of my colleagues who serves on the Committee on Agriculture took violent exception to the Republican members of the committee meeting informally with Secretary Benson prior to the submission of the state of the Union message to Congress. We Republicans are accused of all sorts of dire political shenanigans.

Apparently the rules of the game are being challenged. I have been in this Congress more than 15 years, and I cannot count the number of times that my Democratic friends have met with Cabinet officers in similar circumstances without inviting the opposition.

It might be interesting to note that several of us had asked the Secretary for an audience. He countered with the suggestion that all of us get together to discuss mutual problems. We took advantage of his offer and that accounts for the breakfast.

I would suggest that had the gentleman, and those on his side of the aisle, made a similar request he, too, would have had a free breakfast with the Secretary. In fact, I have an idea that the gentleman and his Democratic colleagues on the committee will be invited to meet with the Secretary whether they initiate the move or not. Of course, I doubt if the gentleman will attend such a gathering since he so violently disapproves of partisan gatherings. That is his privilege.

But let us not forget that similar meetings have been held many, many times in the past by both parties and we Republicans will continue to meet with Cabinet officers any time we have problems to discuss with them.

THE SOIL BANK PROPOSAL

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the President's message was an excellent

one and dealt with the problems of agriculture positively and constructively. It is apparent that any approach to their solution must be aggressive. The soil bank proposal will, if enacted, provide a strong treatment for the burdensome surpluses. These surpluses must be removed by direct action before our farmers can enjoy prosperity. In a later statement, I will discuss some of the details of the President's message.

SHORTAGE OF NEWSPRINT SUPPLY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning there will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the entire Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hear the representative of the Department of Commerce and others on the newsprint-supply situation in the United States. I am sure that almost every Member of this body is acquainted with the critical situation in the supply of newsprint.

I know that this subcommittee, through its chairman, Mr. KLEIN, will delve thoroughly into this situation in order to understand why many companies are not fulfilling their contracts with the newspapers of this country while these same companies are allowing their newsprint to appear on-the-spot market at prices almost 40 percent more than the prices contained in contracts with newspapers. Some of the large companies supplying almost 75 percent of the newsprint of this country have indicated that they will not make up for their failures to comply with their contracts in 1955. In addition, they have notified most of their customers that they intend to cut back 7½ percent on their contract for 1956. All of this has been taking place while their same paper is appearing on what I would term "the gray market" at tremendously increased prices.

In normal times the spot-market price would be somewhat below the contract prices between the newsprint company and the newspaper. Today in the Middle West the ordinary contract price between the newsprint company and the newspaper is around \$130 to \$140. In spite of this the spot-market operator is sending out letters like the following:

Gentlemen, we are looking ahead for 1956 as newsprint is getting very scarce and prices are going up. We suggest, in the event you should require additional tonnage for the year, we want to offer our services to you in purchasing your requirements.

We would like you to let us know ahead of time the sizes you use, so that we can scout around this market to get you newsprint at a low price, instead of paying very exorbitant prices on short notice when you need it.

We promise you that at all times we will deliver to you the finest quality of newsprint, in the proper size that you use, as we did in the past.

Please advise us immediately if you are interested for immediate or future delivery and we will quote you our lowest price.

P. S.—Canadian or American.

Immediate shipment 2 carloads, between January 2 and 10.

Sizes: 15-, 15½-, 16-, 30-, 31-, and 32-inch Canadian.

Wire immediately if interested.

You will note that in this letter he does quote his prices. However, newspapers in the Middle West who have contacted these kind of operators find that the going price today is about \$210. There is a rumor now in the Chicago-Detroit area that the gray-market price is to be increased to \$220.

I think it is apparent to any reasonable observer that when legitimate newspapers cannot get newsprint at contract prices and when apparently gray-market paper is available in almost any quantities for 40 percent more in price, something is seriously wrong in the newsprint industry.

Letters similar to the one I have indicated above are being sent out in great numbers by the spot-market or gray-market operators, indicating that paper in almost any amount can be bought providing the newspaper is willing to pay the gray-market price. From figures I have at this time from the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the four large newsprint companies last year made excellent dividends. In addition these companies within the past few months have increased prices \$10 per ton.

It would appear to me at this time that there is concerted effort at price-fixing in the newsprint field. I am hoping that a determination of this question will be made in these hearings beginning tomorrow. If there is violation of the law either by the newsprint companies or the spot merchants, this matter should be referred to the Attorney General's office for whatever action the evidence justifies.

LOW-INTEREST CREDIT FOR FARMERS AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the President did not recommend long-term, low-interest credit for farmers and livestock producers, which is sorely needed. We had legislation to that effect introduced last year but it was not acted upon, because of opposition on the part of the Department of Agriculture, notwithstanding that they admitted emergency conditions in at least two States, my own State of New Mexico, and Florida. They indicated to us at the time that they might recommend passing such legislation at this session if conditions were not alleviated. They have not been alleviated. On the contrary the emergency need has spread beyond New Mexico and Florida.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture will take up for further consideration the legislation we introduced last year.

PRICE SUPPORT CEILING

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the big farm operator has grown fat on the farm price-support program at the expense of the little farmer. The big farmer sells his crops to the Government, either by direct sales or by defaulting on price-support loans. The little farmer consumes his crop on the farm and often has to buy additional feed and seed from the big farmer at subsidy-inflated prices.

The big farmer's abuse of the program has been shockingly expensive. In 1954, the Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., which operates a 38,000-acre farm, received a price-support loan on cotton totaling \$1,292,472.25. Another cotton farmer received \$814,801, and still another \$624,754. The Campbell Farming Corp., of Hardin, Mont., received a wheat loan in the sum of \$430,691 on 209,000 bushels of wheat. Thirty-seven individual farm operators received loans in excess of \$200,000 each on 1954 crops of wheat, cotton, and rice, and another 16 farmers received in excess of \$100,000 each. These are the farmers who have piled up \$7 billion worth of price-depressing surplus commodities in Government warehouses at a storage cost of a million dollars a day. They have been the beneficiaries and the little farmers the victims.

In an effort to protect the little farmer and the taxpayer from such abuses, I have today introduced a bill placing a support money ceiling of \$25,000 on each basic crop raised by a farm operator, whether that operator be an individual, partnership, or corporation.

This bill would tend to discourage the overproduction of unneeded crops, bring the supply more nearly in balance with demand and help to stabilize the price in the market place. The annual savings realized could be used in basic agricultural research, soil and water conservation, development of new commodity uses and expansion of domestic and foreign markets for the benefit of all farmers, big and little alike.

PEANUTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I presume that the message on agriculture was prepared for the President by the Department of Agriculture. If the entire message is as inconsistent as that portion dealing with peanuts, then no one can depend on the message.

Only last year the Department of Agriculture, at the behest of the confectioners and candymakers, appeared before the Tariff Commission and asked

that the tariff on peanuts be temporarily lifted, stating that there were not enough peanuts under the program produced in America to supply the market. Here in this message the President recommends eliminating the provision of minimum national acreage. Where is consistency in this particular case? I would like for someone to tell me.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have waited patiently for the message we have just received from the President and I am certain that all of us are interested in the message which has just been presented.

As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I would like to say that it is my purpose now to call a meeting of our committee for 10 o'clock tomorrow morning for the purpose of considering every part and parcel of the President's message pertaining to agriculture.

I want to conclude by saying that during the entire time I have served on that committee, and I have served on the committee for more than 20 years, it has been my purpose to keep partisan politics out of our deliberations; and that has been true with reference to all chairmen under whom I have served from Marvin Jones up to the present time. I am certain our committee will give careful consideration to this message and I hope it may be considered without regard to partisan politics.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the House I listened with a great deal of interest to the President's message on agriculture. It seems to me that one of the most important problems in my district at the present time is without a specific solution, and that is, How can the farmer get his full share of the consumer's dollar?

As you know, the Secretary of Agriculture has announced that the farmer this month will get 39 cents out of each consumer's dollar spent for agricultural commodities. I listen at times with a great deal of pleasure to one of my colleagues on the other side who talks about the prosperous farmer with a ham under each arm. I want to say to you here this afternoon that is about the only place the farmers in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida can put the wonderful hams they produce, because they are getting less than production cost.

I hope that during our consideration of this problem we can come out with some system fair to the consumer, fair to the taxpayer, and fair to the American

farmer who does not receive a livable share of the consumer's dollar spent for agricultural commodities.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I note in the message from the President which has just been read another example of appeasing the Communist conspiracy and an expression of lack of confidence in the ability of free nations to exist and prosper in an arrangement which excludes the participation of Communist and Communist-dominated nations. Congress gave long and thoughtful consideration to the state of world affairs which now exist when it enacted into Public Law 480, 83d Congress, the section 304. I am amazed that at this time when the security, liberty, and freedom of the American people are in greater danger than ever before in our history that the President's message leads from fear and lack of confidence in our ability to use our surplus agricultural commodities in the cause of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it was my opportunity to spend 7 weeks in southeast Asia and north Asia on an official inspection trip recently concluded. During that trip I saw innumerable opportunities where our surplus agricultural commodities could be used to strengthen the cause of freedom and individual liberty in those newly independent nations of Asia.

I can assure Members of this House that vast amounts of our surplus food could be used in that part of the world without in any way interfering with the normal commercial channels and trade. I must also say that I felt warmed by the wisdom of Congress in providing wide authority for the administration to use up to \$1 billion of our surplus commodities over a 3-year period in programs calculated to advance the cause of peace and freedom.

There is scarce a Member of this House who is not acutely aware of the vital struggle now taking place throughout all of Asia between those who stand for decency and human dignity and those who support the Russian drive for world domain. All of us realize the grave possibility that world war III could result from the political struggle now taking place throughout all of Asia. We must use every one of our assets together with imagination and courage if we are to save the day in Asia for human freedom and at the same time prevent world war III.

What we need more than anything else is imagination and old-fashioned American ingenuity in order to put our surplus agricultural commodities to work in the cause of a just and lasting peace. Up to the present, the administration has been timid, hesitating, and unimaginative in applying the obvious benefits of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, section 304. In fairness, I must say that in some instances, notably in Vietnam, the Crown Colony of Hong Kong, and in Korea, where the administration has used initiative and imagination in the use of our

surplus agricultural commodities, results have been most gratifying. But looking at the world as a whole and knowing that one-half of the people of the world still go to bed hungry, it should be obvious to all that the administration should immediately engage in a wide-scale program using our surplus foods as weapons for peace.

On March 22, last year, President Eisenhower, in an address before the Advertising Council at its meeting in Washington, showed a real grasp of the world crisis when he called for a program which would develop a trading bloc made up of all the free nations of the world. The President then advocated—and I quote—"a legitimate economic union of the free world in order that it may cleave to these great spiritual truths, which in turn make it a unity in opposing communism." This plan envisions the utilization of the resources of the free world to strengthen all those countries who are fighting to keep their national independence and freedom. He also pointed out the economic pressures the Russian Communist bloc was exerting upon certain countries and the need of still other countries for foreign trade as a means of existence. There are a considerable number of countries of the world who cannot produce enough food to meet the requirements of their people and who therefore must acquire a favorable foreign trade balance in order to meet their food deficit. I commend the proposal made by President Eisenhower on that occasion because it was clear to me that this was one method by which we would finally put to work our surplus agricultural commodities which unfortunately some people have been regarding as a liability rather than an asset unprecedented in all of history. From this latest message of the President, it appears that the President has made a complete flip-flop on the position which he took on March 22, 1955, in his speech before the Advertising Council of Washington.

This latest recommendation of the President arouses the suspicion that the "fast buck" boys are busier than ever in putting across their program with the present administration. There are interests at work in this country who see in trade with the Russian Communists and their widespread empire, a harvest of lush profits. These same interests completely disregard the security interests of the people of the United States and in no way are concerned with the need to strengthen the cause of human freedom in those areas of the world where today it is fighting for its very existence. These same interests are not concerned to prevent world war III because their only interest is milking lush profits from the misery of the human race.

I strongly urge that Congress take a good look at what lies behind the recommendation of the President with respect to Public Law 480, 83d Congress, section 304. I also urge the President of the United States to renew his efforts to find people possessed of the initiative, the imagination, and the leadership qualities necessary to bring about the full benefits Congress intended when it passed Public Law 480, 83d Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the reading of the President's message to the Congress on agriculture. In it he lists his nine-point program for alleviating the ills which threaten the economy of the agricultural portion of the American population.

The absence of a proposal for a rigid price-support law based on 90 percent of parity did not surprise me. We remember full well that during the presidential campaign of 1952 the Republican presidential candidate said, "I think farm prices ought to be based on 100 percent of parity." But during the nearly 3 years he has served as President of the United States he has successfully sought to prevent the enactment of a price support law based on 90 percent of parity.

I do not for one moment contend that a rigid price support law based on 90 percent of parity is either a panacea or a cure-all which will immediately solve the farm problem. I do believe, however, that if we are to have a farm price support law that it must be based on rigid terms and that the support prices of agricultural commodities covered by it shall not drop below 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that farming is a hazardous occupation, economically speaking, and that year in and year out, a 10 percent marginal profit is better than most farmers receive. This is especially true of the small family-size farmer in whom I am primarily and vitally interested.

The President is correct in his statement that the present agricultural surpluses present the main problem confronting the American farmer at this time. If the present Secretary of Agriculture had approached this matter from a realistic viewpoint during the past 3 years these surpluses would not have reached the staggering proportions which they have assumed. During the past 3 years the Department of Agriculture has done little or nothing to further the causes of research for new uses for basic commodities, especially cotton, and has permitted an annual increase in the stockpiles of the basic agricultural commodities.

The President's approach to the soil bank and acreage reserve program are both unrealistic. They would work directly in favor of the already huge corporate type farmers and it would be one step more toward the complete liquidation of the American family size farm. In the Fourth District of Georgia there are good farmers, conscientious and hard working, who formerly operated what we call 1- and 2-horse farms with from 20 to 40 acres of cotton who are now reduced to 3 and 4 acres. What earthly good would it do such a farmer to put 1 acre in a soil bank?

The present administration of the Department of Agriculture has reduced the cotton acreage in Georgia for 1956 more than 47,000 acres over what it was in 1955. At the same time they have increased the cotton acreage for California and Arizona—combined—by 13,426 acres. The net result of this will be that the irrigated and moisture-controlled farms in the fertile irrigated valleys of these two fine Western States will produce more cotton than would have been produced on the 47,597 acres of upland cotton farms in Georgia. Instead of helping reduce the surplus, this will do much to increase the already staggering size of the cotton surplus.

The President's proposal to raise the present designation of middling seven-eighths-inch cotton as the standard grade for parity calculations and price support will have the immediate effect in next year's crop of reducing both the gross and net income to the cotton growers of America.

The President's recommendation for elimination of the provision for the minimum national acreage allotment for peanuts is in direct contradiction to the administration's proposal in 1955 to admit into this country duty free millions of pounds of peanuts because of an alleged shortage of peanuts in this country.

The President's recommendation for legislation to relieve the farmer of the Federal tax on gasoline used in tractors and other nonhighway vehicles is a sound proposal. It is already the law in the State which I have the honor to represent. I have favored this proposal not only since I have been in Congress but prior to coming to Congress. I cannot help but wonder if there is any connection between this proposal and the fact that 1956 is a Presidential election year.

Mr. Speaker, in the President's agricultural message it is evident that the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau. The present Republican administration and the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson have had 3 years in which to help the American farmer. It is quite evident that the nearness of the 1956 elections has increased the desire of the administration to help the American farmer. I do not believe that the American farmer and his votes in the 1956 elections can be bought by empty promises in election year which are diametrically opposed to the record of the present Republican administration from January 1953 until now.

THE SMALL TOBACCO FARMER

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, the small tobacco farmers were not even mentioned by the administration in its farm message. We have in West Virginia about 4,360 small tobacco farmers

with an average of about six-tenths of an acre for their cash crop. We have many, many thousands of small tobacco farmers all over these United States that are sadly in need of help.

There are the burley tobacco farmers with small acreage just existing in the narrow valleys between the mountains suffering on account of lack of clothes in these cold winter months, suffering from lack of medical attention and proper housing, yet the administration does not even mention them.

It is a sad commentary that in these great United States they do not even mention these people.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and I have this day dropped into the hopper a joint resolution asking that the Congress authorize the appointment of special counsel to guard the taxpayers' interest in the Dixon-Yates contract cancellation case.

It will be remembered that last year we led, against great odds, the fight for termination of this contract. But eventually the administration came around to our point of view and held that it was a contract that was not in the best interest of the United States. The Dixon-Yates corporate interests have requested several million dollars in special damages.

In view of the fact that the Attorney General and the counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission have both rendered opinions at various times attesting to the validity of this contract, we feel they are disqualified to proceed in this suit for the taxpayers. We therefore believe that special counsel should be appointed to do this job and we have dropped into the hopper this joint resolution.

THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for the statement he made on the floor of the House this morning to the effect that as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, it is his purpose to treat the agricultural problem when before his committee for consideration in a manner in which it should be treated as an economic question and not as a political proposition.

As one who represents a great agricultural district, I am at a complete loss to know how anyone can try to legislate for a Republican farmer on one side of the road as against a Democratic farmer on

the other side of the road, or vice versa. It simply cannot be done; and I, for one, would never attempt it. My responsibility, as the Representative of a splendid agricultural district is to legislate in the best interests of agriculture as a whole. This is an economic problem confronting us, not a political question. As the President pointed out in his state of the Union message, there is too much at stake to have this become "the field for political warfare."

Mr. Speaker, I exceedingly regret that a few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] saw fit to refer to the President's message on agriculture in the manner he did. He characterized it as a Republican vote-buying proposal. Let me say to him that the farmers of my district are not for sale, nor do I believe they are anywhere. I think, therefore, he should reconsider the statement he has made.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, along with a lot of the other Members of the House, I have listened very attentively to the reading of the President's message on agriculture. He did exactly what I expected him to do. It brings us a lot of window dressing with a lot of frosting to decorate the cake, but it left the keystone completely out of the arch.

That keystone is firm and adequate price supports, without which any farm program is bound to collapse, leaving the individual farmer where he has been for the last 3 years, namely, at the mercy of the buyer.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE FARM SITUATION IN MISSOURI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks here this afternoon with a reminder that the 1st session of the 84th Congress adjourned sine die at 11:36 p. m. on August 2, 1955.

This speech would have been made on August 3, 1955, had Congress been in session. However, I would like to remind my colleagues that this is the first opportunity that I have had to make the remarks which are in the nature of a reply or comment on the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from St. Louis County, Mo., which appear on page

12985 of the RECORD of August 2, 1955, the day that the 1st session of the 84th Congress adjourned.

Actually, these remarks could and probably would have been made on the closing day of the session, August 2, 1955, had I been apprised of the context of the remarks by my colleague, which appeared in the RECORD of that day, but which, of course, I did not hear although I was on the floor of the House. I also will direct my remarks to certain statements which appeared in a letter under date of August 2, 1955, addressed to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and signed by my colleague from Missouri, which letter, as he stated, was widely publicized and also appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1955.

I think it should be understood, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks inserted by my colleague and which appeared to have been made on the floor of the House actually were an extension of remarks "at this point in the RECORD," and there was no opportunity for me to answer those remarks which both directly and indirectly referred to remarks which I had made here on the floor of the House when my colleague was present.

To refresh your memory, let us refer to page 12985 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1955, the closing day of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, when House Resolution 333 was under consideration. Now this particular resolution would make in order the consideration of H. R. 7718, which was a bill to authorize the Capital Transit Co. to surrender its franchise. I was on the floor during the consideration of that resolution, and, to refresh your memory, I think you will recall that the gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, was rather anxious to have the resolution considered in a minimum of time in order that we could get down to a discussion of the bill dealing with the Capital Transit Co. An emergency was in effect at that time, as you will recall. Now during the consideration of the resolution on the rule, the gentleman from Illinois was allotting time, and on page 12985 we read:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The RECORD also states at that point:

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Now, I want to make this point clear, Mr. Speaker. While my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] did get permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, he did not ask permission to speak out of order. There was nothing said at that time and I was on the floor of the House when those proceedings took place, and I know that the RECORD is correct when it states that he was merely "given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD," and it was presumed both by myself and, I believe, by other Members or the House who were here on the floor when we were discussing the Capital Transit Co., that my colleague intended

and he certainly left the impression that he wanted to insert his remarks which pertained to the Capital Transit Co. legislation. Instead, Mr. Speaker, when the RECORD appeared on the day following the adjournment of Congress, I was amazed to learn that there had been inserted a highly controversial, political speech in the RECORD, dealing with the conduct of the Department of Agriculture, specifically with the ASC program in Missouri.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to call your attention to my colleague's own statement of what he has referred to as a device, which in his own words he says, "leaves open to question by fairminded people the sincerity and accuracy of their charges." Mr. Speaker, I should mention that I have notified my colleague from Missouri that I would direct my remarks at certain statements which he caused to have inserted in the RECORD on August 2, 1955.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not at this time and place questioning the sincerity of my colleague in using this device and his employment of this technique, although I am questioning and will at this first opportunity that I have had challenge the accuracy of the statements which he caused to have inserted in the RECORD on August 2, 1955—at which time he did not indicate that he would speak out of order—and would discuss a subject entirely foreign to the resolution under consideration.

Neither, Mr. Speaker, would I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri did not realize that he was acting in a manner which he had on that very day condemned.

I have said that my colleague from Missouri, has brought upon himself this self-indictment, which appears in a letter written on the very day that he caused to have inserted in the RECORD the remarks which were unavailable for reply or comment until the following day when the 1st session of the 84th Congress had been adjourned.

In the letter referred to, under date of August 2, 1955, addressed to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson and signed by my colleague, which letter was given wide publicity, including its reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my colleague sets forth what I presume to be his code of ethics. Incidentally, this letter appeared in the RECORD, not as an extension of remarks of my colleague, but was inserted by a Member of the other body, presumably because my colleague was anxious not to violate the rules of the House by openly criticizing a Member of the other body.

I will now read from the third paragraph of that letter, omitting the names of two Members of the other body, and here I quote from the letter addressed to Secretary Benson and signed by my colleague:

Now, almost from the time that the Eisenhower administration took office they have been making general charges of political manipulation of the farm program in Missouri. Congressman PAUL JONES also has been making general charges in the beginning on the floor of the House, but I am happy to state not on the floor of the House since I challenged him to either back up his charges with details or desist.

Is not that a laugh, Mr. Speaker? The membership of this House knows, and I believe my colleague knows that I have never made a statement of the floor of this House that I could not back up, and as far as my good friend from Missouri, the self-appointed spokesman for the Republican Party in Missouri, causing me to cease and desist from such remarks, I can only say that he has added coals to the fire which while it has been burning evenly and steadily is now ready to burst into a big hot flame which I promise you will not only smoke them out in the open, but which will cause more than one to seek to get away from the heat of burning truth.

But before we get on with a reply to some of the political propaganda which my colleague had inserted in the RECORD, but which, of course, was never made on the floor of this House, let me proceed with a recitation of the Curtis code of ethics.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point for a comment on what he has stated?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield for a minute.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I simply wanted to point out that in my comments I started out by saying that on July 29 there were some 10 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD filled by Members of the other body alleging that there were political manipulations in the farm program in Missouri.

The RECORD will also show, and I think the gentleman will recall, that the Speaker had ruled, I believe it was on Thursday, that in the last few days there would be nothing other than extensions of remarks allowed in the RECORD, that we would not be permitted special orders, or given special time on the floor. I can assure the gentleman that if the circumstances had been otherwise, I would have been on the floor and I would have notified the gentleman about it, because I do feel that is the correct procedure. I think, to that extent, the gentleman's remarks have pertinency.

I think without those explanations, the gentleman's criticism of what was done would be justified. But with those explanations, and in view of the 10 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attacking the Missouri farm program, made in the other body, there was no other way to answer that before the hearings which were held by a subcommittee of the other body, in Missouri, this last fall, were had. That was the reason.

I simply wanted to get that point across. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not recall that toward the end of the session the Speaker ruled that there would be no special orders allowed, no 1-minute speeches, but only extensions in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I decline to yield further. I will yield to the gentleman at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I decline to yield further, but I will answer that as I continue with this speech. I am glad

to see the gentleman admits he has made a mistake.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not. Mr. JONES of Missouri. I refuse to yield further at this point.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. He said I admitted I made a mistake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point of order is that the gentleman has misstated what I said. I did not admit any mistake at all. I simply said there was an explanation for the thing. I made no mistake. I would do the same thing again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Continuing with the reading of my colleague's letter to the Secretary, and I am reading only his words, it states:

Most of the charges made have been ex parte in political speeches and in releases to the newspapers.

Now get this next statement, if you will, Mr. Speaker, when my colleague writes:

Seldom have the charges been made on the floor of the House or Senate where they were subject to rebuttal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I interpret this to mean that my colleague considers this a reprehensible practice when one makes statements which cannot be answered in rebuttal.

He writes further:

The statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1955, were essentially insertions in the RECORD and not matters openly expressed on the floor of the Senate.

But here is the crowning statement, and I hope that my colleague will be listening carefully as I read this statement from his letter to the Secretary:

It is a well-recognized device and all too frequently used by Senators and Congressmen to insert material in the RECORD as if—

And I repeat "as if"—

it had been presented orally on the floor.

Now here comes the part that I like to refer to as the Curtis code of ethics, in which my colleague outlines what he considers "proper technique":

The only proper technique to use when attacking a program, or a policy, or a man, or a group of men, is to notify ahead of time those you know take a contrary position to yours, that you intend to take the floor at such and such a time, and discuss the matter. I—

And remember this is my colleague writing—

have many times used this technique in launching an attack on something I thought was wrong or improper. The failure of any Senator or Congressman to employ this technique leaves open to question by fairminded people the sincerity and accuracy of their charges.

Now, I am certain that my colleague considers that he is a fairminded person, and I feel just as certain that it will be enlightening, as well as entertaining to hear him justify his action of August 2,

1955, on the last day of the session when he followed the same practice he has condemned in his letter. Naturally I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri, for any reply he may care to make, at the conclusion of my remarks directed specifically at the charges made in his written remarks which were inserted in the RECORD on August 2, 1955, and which were unavailable to me until after Congress had adjourned, depriving me of the opportunity, until now, of making the reply that would have been made on August 2, 1955, had there been any notice given that my colleague was speaking out of order when he had these remarks inserted in the RECORD.

Yes, I have been critical of the operation of the ASC program in Missouri. I have cited cases, both on and off this floor, in letters and telegram, and in personal conversation with Secretary Benson, his Under Secretary, True Morse, and to other officials in the Department of Agriculture that a politically dictated and politically operated program was being imposed on the farmers in Missouri.

I have in the past made specific charges in my criticism of the politically dominated operation of the ASC program in Missouri. I have said in the past and I repeat now that the policies enunciated by the Department of Agriculture here in Washington are not being carried out in Missouri in the selection and appointment of county office managers. Despite any denials to the contrary, there is every evidence that in many counties competent, qualified, and experienced men who have been recommended and hired by county committees have been disapproved for employment by the State committee solely because they were Democrats and the county committees forced under pressure, including threats of suspension, to hire other persons of less experience whose competence has been challenged, and who have not possessed the so-called minimum requirements.

In Missouri, and out of fairness to those officials of the Department of Agriculture here in Washington who are trying to do a good job, I want to say that there appears to be the most flagrant violation of the regulations in my State where the program has been not only dominated by the chairman of the Republican State committee, but he has actually been vested with the authority of hiring and firing those employees whom the Department of Agriculture contends are selected by the county ASC committees.

Mr. Speaker, a public hearing conducted by a committee of Congress was held in Jefferson City, Mo., on November 14 and 15, when scores of witnesses were heard, and during which more than 200,000 words of testimony, mostly under oath, were taken.

This testimony is, I am certain, available to Secretary Benson. I am of the opinion that after he reads this sworn testimony he should be convinced that the policies which he contends are followed by his Department are not being carried out in Missouri where the chairman of the State ASC committee

appears to be a puppet in the hands of the chairman of the Republican State committee.

The Secretary of Agriculture may be amazed to find out that in certain counties where the office manager has been discharged by the county committee that the discharged office manager is still being paid from public funds, which in itself appears to be a violation of the law, apparently condoned by the State committee as well as by Secretary Benson, despite the clearness of his own regulations which state that the county committee does have the authority to discharge a county office manager.

Mr. Speaker, the sworn testimony at the hearing in Jefferson City, on November 14 and 15, shows that in Calhoun County a county committee was suspended solely on the ground that it would not employ an office manager selected by the State committee which refused to approve any of several qualified men selected by the county committee, all of whom met the standards and qualifications set forth in the regulations.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that I have been correct in the charges that I have made since the reorganization of the farm program, which charges have been reiterated from time to time, that in Missouri, at least, one of the unwritten regulations is that before any person can be approved as an office manager he must be approved by the Republican State committee.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my resentment to this procedure is unduly influenced by a personal experience in my home county of Dunklin, which is one of the leading Democratic counties in Missouri. We have never had any partisan politics in the operation of the farm program in Dunklin County. Under the long Democratic administration the farmers elected their own farm committees with no thought as to politics and both Democrats and Republicans served efficiently and harmoniously. For many years a good Republican friend of mine served as a member of the county committee; later as chief clerk of the committee and at the present time as the office manager. In each of these positions he has done an excellent job. Had there been any desire to operate the program on a political basis, this man could never have been elected, but as I say there was no politics in the operation of the farm program in Dunklin County under the last Democratic administration and that is why I am so concerned now when it is so apparent that all over Missouri this administration has permitted a vicious ruthless Republican political organization to take charge of what has always been a farmer-operated program, and to ride roughshod over our farmers in Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues from other States will be amazed when I tell you that in Missouri, during the administration of the farm program during the last 3 years, a total of 55 members of county committees, duly elected by the farmers in their counties have been suspended or discharged by the Missouri ASC State committee, dominated and controlled by the chairman of the Republican State committee in Missouri. Mr. Speaker, those 55

duly elected committeemen who have been suspended or discharged in Missouri represent more than 25 percent of all of the county committee members who have been suspended or discharged throughout the entire 48 States. Can you wonder that we in Missouri feel that the program has not been operated in the best interest of the farmer, and why we of the Missouri delegation have protested over the high-handed manner in which partisan politics has been allowed to dictate the operation of this program?

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the farm program, and I have worked hard trying to bring about changes which will be most helpful to the farmers of my district, the State of Missouri and the entire Nation.

It is unfortunate, of course, that some of our colleagues, particularly those who come from metropolitan areas, who have one or no rural agricultural counties in their districts, and who know little, if nothing, about the problems, seek to set themselves up as spokesmen for their State ASC committees, and the Department of Agriculture, echoing statements which they later have to retract upon being confronted with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the hearings recently held in Jefferson City, and of course I am not going to include the more than 200,000 words in this speech since the hearings will be printed, I will only point out some typical examples of the high-handed manner in which the Republican-controlled ASC committee in Missouri has been operating.

Not only does the chairman of the State committee, Mr. Murray Colbert, under oath, admit that his committee told a county committee that unless they appointed a man selected by the State committee as county office manager that the county committee would be suspended or dismissed, but in his admission he frankly stated on interrogation that, "maybe I didn't correctly have the authority," and added, "I haven't been perfect all my life." After admitting, under oath, that the man selected by the county committee did have the minimum qualifications, Mr. Colbert went on to admit further that the county committee was dismissed solely on the grounds that the committee would not employ the office manager selected by the State committee. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to read in this same testimony that Mr. Colbert, the State ASC chairman, still insists that his committee is operating under procedures set forth by the Department of Agriculture.

But the real tragedy of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the Secretary of Agriculture, apparently not only condones, but actually approves the illegal practices which are taking place in Missouri, for no later than last week, the announcement was made that the chairman of the Missouri ASC committee has been reappointed. And remember, this announcement of the reappointment of this man was made after Secretary Benson had an opportunity to read the sworn testimony of the hearings in Jefferson City, including the statement of the chairman of the State committee when he admitted that he took action in the discharging of members of county

committees which action was in direct violation of the law and the regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In a letter, under date of December 30, 1955, addressed to the two distinguished Senators from Missouri, and signed by True D. Morse, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, that official, presumably acting in the absence of Secretary Benson, seeks to evade the responsibility which rests directly on the shoulders of the Secretary, by declining to review the illegal operation of the ASC program in Missouri. Instead he suggests that those 55 committeemen who have been suspended, dismissed, and discharged, file an appeal with the State ASC committee in Missouri. Imagine, those who have been unjustly wronged filing an appeal with a committee, the chairman of which has already under oath admitted practices which the Department of Agriculture regulations clearly state are violations of the law.

It is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that it now appears that the only relief that the farmers of Missouri can expect under such disgraceful conditions as Secretary Benson has permitted to exist in our State is for Congress to pass legislation which will spell out specifically that the selection of members of the county committees shall rest solely with the farmers of that county, and that they be permitted to select the employees of their own office without interference from any partisan political committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have told you some of the political things that are taking place in Missouri in the administration of the farm program. That is why it is distressing to me to read in the President's message on the state of the Union the statement that we should approach the agricultural problem on a bipartisan or nonpartisan basis; and yet we have the farm program under the direction of a Secretary of Agriculture who has refused even to see that the law is enforced in his own Department in the State of Missouri as it refers to the political activity of the Republican State committee. Remember, we have sworn testimony there that his State committee has openly violated the law, yet he refused to review the actions of that State committee.

What can we expect when we read in this message today talking about putting payments through the ASC committee? Am I to expect that in my county that a committee—and I should not say in my county because we have a good committee in my county and have had all the time; but are we going to permit the State committee to appoint political hacks to run the farm program in Missouri? Does it mean that they are going to have control of these funds that we are going to pay? These are some of the things we have got to look into. I have got to see the Secretary get his hands clean before he starts this program; they are not clean at this time. He has refused to review these charges that have been brought to his attention, but tells us to go to the State committee dominated by Republicans to get redress.

I have one other comment to make about the President's message today and that is with regard to his suggestion on

the farm program. This message contains a lot of promises, and I do know that sometimes when your farmers are in distress they are misled by promises just as they were in 1952 when candidate Eisenhower promised them 100 percent of parity. Some were misled and voted the Republican ticket, and I have letters in my files from Republicans who apologized for their mistake at that time. Let me call your attention to this statement in the President's message of today:

I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

I wonder if sometime later we will have someone trying to explain that "full" does not mean 100 percent. When I think about "full," I think about 100 percent and running over. We are going to have to have that explained, too. I am not going to take any further time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask whether or not in connection with these committeemen the gentleman referred to the Department of Agriculture through its officials preferred any charges against them that were dismissed?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In many cases they suspended people, keeping them off the job for as long as 30 days, during which time they consistently refrained from filing any charges. In some instances those committeemen were reinstated without charges ever having been filed at any time.

Mr. COOLEY. I am referring specifically to those who have been dismissed. Were they given a day in court?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They were not.

Mr. COOLEY. Were they given an opportunity to see, to read, and to understand the charges that had been preferred against them?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I could not say in all cases, but I do know in some of the cases with which I am familiar that members of the committee who were dismissed were denied the opportunity of seeing any of the charges that were made against them.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman indicates that he thinks these dismissals were prompted by politics.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The sworn testimony of the hearing at Jefferson City bears that out. Witness after witness, and even Mr. Colbert, the chairman of the State committee, admitted that he told these people he would fire them if they did not hire a Republican appointee as county office manager.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand the program, it is contemplated that the local committeemen shall be elected by the farmers.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right. That is what has been our understanding.

Mr. COOLEY. By what authority does the Secretary dismiss duly elected committeemen except for corruption or malfeasance in office or something of that kind?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the charges have been made through the State committee that they will not cooperate with the State committee in the majority of cases and it is stated that that cooperation, or lack of cooperation, has been based upon refusal of the county committee to hire a county office manager selected by the State committee, whereas the rules and regulations clearly state that the county committee has the right to select the county office manager with the approval of the State committee.

Mr. COOLEY. When a committeeman is once dismissed, as I understand what the gentleman is saying, the Secretary of Agriculture takes it upon himself, operating through the State committee, to fill the vacancy which has been created by appointing someone to take over the duties of the man who had theretofore been duly elected by the farmers?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think that is right, although I do not want to state that as a fact.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman who has served on a county committee and who was also at the hearing at Jefferson City.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. When a committeeman is discharged, the alternate comes in and takes his place. If the alternate is discharged, another election is held.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for about 5 minutes?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, first I want to comment on what my colleague said in reference to the Curtis code of ethics having to do with presenting and debating matters on the floor of the House. What he read in that letter I reiterate. I think it is very important that all of us, if we can, follow that procedure.

I want to point out that far from launching an attack on August 2 I was trying to answer an attack that had been launched on July 29 on the floor of the Senate which was given wide publicity and laying the groundwork, I might state, for this Senate subcommittee hearing out in Missouri.

It was impossible in the last few days of the session—I know we all realize that—under the Speaker's ruling to secure special orders for any length of time, or even to get one minute to speak. The best we could do was to insert something in the RECORD. I know the gentleman from Missouri also recognizes that those last few days are hectic ones. Personally, I regret that there was not the opportunity available to either him or me to have taken the floor of the House so that we could have conducted a debate somewhat along these lines in order to go into the charges that had been made and to see whether or not they

were justified. I do not apologize for using that procedure at the tail end of the session because it was the only method we had available. I would do so again. I do believe, however, that whenever possible—which is usually most of the time—this procedure should be followed. I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri also for notifying me ahead of time that he was going to bring this matter up on the floor of the House today. I think that is proper.

Now just one general remark in regard to these hearings in Missouri. Regrettably, the hearings, at least as far as I know, are not available yet and have not been printed up. I know the Senate subcommittee has not even commented on it, so I think it is highly improper for us here today to be debating conclusions from what that evidence might adduce, as well as—and we are unable to do this, I might state—even comment on the procedures used at the hearings, because it happens to be a Senate subcommittee. It is going to be pretty difficult for us to debate what went on in a Senate subcommittee hearing here on the floor of the House. I regret it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It was a public hearing. The gentleman was there.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I was there.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And other people were there, and everything said there was available to the public and to the Secretary of Agriculture who declined an opportunity to be represented and to be heard at that hearing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. To that extent I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. The matters brought up in that hearing and the testimony adduced, if we can refer to that specifically and agree on what was said, why then, yes, we can, but the difficulty lies in the fact—and I do not want to traduce our rules on this. Let us put it this way. There is some question as to the equitableness, the fairness of the procedures of that hearing or any hearing, for that matter. There is always that question of whether or not both sides were given ample opportunity to present their side of the case as well as to cross-examine witnesses, and so forth, and so forth. Those things always come up. I believe that there will be quite a bit of discussion on the floor of the Senate in regard to that matter. But, as far as some of the general conclusions that my colleague drew from testimony that was adduced at Jefferson City, I must say that I was there the entire time with the exception of a few hours. Incidentally, those hearings went from 9 o'clock one morning until midnight. I missed the after-dinner session that one evening, but then we took up again the next day at 9 o'clock and quit at 1 o'clock in the morning, and I was there the entire time, and I can state that I cannot agree with my colleague from Missouri as to either the testimony or certainly the conclusions

drawn from that. I, myself, have already commented in a letter that I wrote to the Department of Agriculture giving them the benefit of my views and the conclusions I drew from the hearings.

I might say to my colleague from Missouri that there incidentally was a forum for him to have presented some of these charges that he had been making which lay at the base for this trouble in Missouri. I certainly was there those 2 days in order to do what I could to refute those charges which I think were not correct, but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], did not avail himself of that forum; at least, he was not present there, and that is one of the places where we can iron these things out to find out whether they are true or not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman did not mean to infer that at a congressional hearing is the time for Members to debate the program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is the time to get the facts out in the open to find out if there are specific data that will back up general charges, yes, I do, and it is from those things that you can then go on to debate.

And, I want to point out one other thing. Your quotation of Mr. Colbert saying that they would have to hire Republicans is directly contrary to the evidence. In fact, Mr. Colbert said just the opposite. And, the test of whether or not political hacks have been hired in Missouri, is that 70 percent of the county managers that have been hired under the present program have had bachelor of science degrees in agriculture, and that is something no other State in the Union can match, and I think if we can only go on that plane to try to get better qualified people on those jobs, the program is going to benefit. Senator HUMPHREY at the tailend of the hearing said that: At any rate, at least, it looks like the farm program is going on all right even though there is a lot of argument over the technical personnel administration of the thing.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman is talking about getting the facts. Does he not think the best way to get the facts is to bring in witnesses and place them under oath?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And that was done at this hearing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But there was no opportunity to cross-examine or bring in rebuttal witnesses.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman is not saying at this time that Mr. Colbert did not admit that he fired one county committee because specifically they would not hire the county office manager that had been recommended by the State committee? The gentleman would not say he did not testify to that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; it is a great deal more complicated than that. He did not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman says that he did not admit that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right; not in the words that the gentleman has used. The gentleman asked a specific question. He asked whether he said this and that, and I said, "No; he did not"; the question involved was a great

deal more complicated than the way the gentleman presented it. I think if the gentleman had listened to the witnesses at those hearings, he would have seen that it was a great deal more complicated. It was not an open-and-shut thing.

There is a real area here where we, in Congress, ought to be figuring out just how we want these committees set up and we must not blame people down the line for a failure to clarify the picture.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I still say that I am blaming the operation of the program in Missouri where 55 committeemen were suspended or dismissed. That represents 25 percent of all the dismissals which have taken place in the United States. Surely there is something wrong there.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There was something wrong. My allegation was that there were political manipulations before.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say this. The gentleman from Missouri, from St. Louis County, will not deny, I believe, that the chairman of the State committee in Missouri made this specific statement that I quoted: "Maybe I did not correctly have the authority," and "I have not been perfect all my life."

Does the gentleman deny that he did not make those statements?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will give the rest of the context of the statement, it would clear it up. Does the gentleman not admit that he makes mistakes too? There are a lot of mistakes made, and some of them are honest ones.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In the particular case I am talking about where he said he fired the committee because they would not select a certain county office manager—one that the State committee had selected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; that is not the fact.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have a copy of the sworn testimony in which that statement is made.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to see it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And I will state it as a fact.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was present.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

I shall also state that the Secretary of Agriculture has been furnished with copies of this sworn testimony. It has been documented to him under oath showing where this program has been operated illegally in Missouri. And in a letter, which I have here, he refused to review the situation in Missouri, to see that that politically dominated machine does not still operate the ASC program in Missouri.

I am stating that as a fact.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman should correct his remarks. The gentleman referred to the county committee when I think he intended to refer to the

manager of the county office. If I understand the gentleman, these men were fired because they did not employ a certain person as manager of the office.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Who was recommended to them to be employed?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. And that is what happened?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is what happened.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and if the gentleman thinks that this matter needs to be further investigated, I am sure the gentleman knows that the House has authorized our committee, through subcommittee or otherwise, to investigate charges such as the gentleman is now bringing to the attention of the House. If the gentleman is unable to obtain accurate information in regard to the dismissal of these 55 county committeemen in the State of Missouri, I can assure the gentleman that our committee will cooperate with him in trying to obtain accurate information.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee, but I think that all of this information taken under oath will be available to the Congress. I think we perhaps will want to take some action in passing legislation. We have found in the past that frequently when we pass legislation in which there is some discretion left to the administrator the intent of Congress is not carried out and later we must come back and amend that legislation. I think that is what is taking place here. The Secretary of Agriculture has gone beyond the intent of Congress in his interpretation.

I will say this, and I want to be perfectly fair in this matter. There are some employees in the Department of Agriculture who have apologized to me for some of the things that have taken place there in Missouri. I have been told by people in high position in the Department of Agriculture that they should have stopped this thing several months ago when it was first called to their attention. In fact, they brought the State committee up here one time, and it was generally understood at that time that either the State committee was going to be discharged or at least they were going to be disciplined to get the thing back on the beam.

In that connection, may I ask my colleague from St. Louis County one question: Does he know of the chairman of the ASC committee in Missouri ever coming to Washington on official business when he was not accompanied by the chairman of the Republican State committee?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will answer that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes to answer that question. He could answer it yes or no. Does he know of any such occasion?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I had only one occasion to meet the gentleman concerned, Mr. Colbert, in Washington. On

that occasion it was the time I referred to when he was brought here to answer these charges, and he was accompanied by the State chairman, which I thought was quite appropriate, inasmuch as the charges were made that there had been political manipulations.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I asked the gentleman a simple question. Does he know of any visit the chairman of the State ASC committee in Missouri has made to Washington on official business—and he has made several such visits here—when he was not accompanied by the chairman of the Republican State committee?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I answered within my knowledge, that there was only one time that he was in Washington that I knew about.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I asked the gentleman to answer "Yes" or "No." Does he know about any?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The one time I saw him it was true. I may say to the gentleman that as far as that particular occasion is concerned, it involved the Mississippi County situation, which I personally went into. I am very happy that the Department of Agriculture had the good sense to back up the State committee on that thing in the final run, because the action taken I think was clearly proven to be in the best interests of the farmer and the farm program, and yet politics was alleged in that instance, too.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will not agree with anything that is said about that, because the gentleman is just as wrong about that as he has been in some of the other cases. He is just as wrong about that as he was when he went before a committee and told about a man being put in the penitentiary and serving a sentence, and then later he had to retract that and admit the man got a \$100 fine.

WHITHER STATESMANSHIP?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] for this afternoon be vacated, and that he be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, September 24, 1955, will take its place in history as one of the dark and fateful days of American history.

In the early hours of dawn, on that day, our great President and patriot, Dwight D. Eisenhower, suffered a heart attack of unknown intensity and the distressing news was dispatched to the four corners of a stunned and sorrowful world. Bewilderment and disorder of panic proportions began. Humble, but fervent, prayers were soberly chorused in scores of foreign tongues and foreign lands, as well as in our great country. The whole world waited with bated breath for the successive bulletins issued from the bedside at Denver, Colorado. God be praised. Our pray-

ers were answered, and the bulletins almost immediately struck a note of encouragement and hope. Our gloom gradually became dispelled—at least temporarily.

Since that time there has been a constant din of speculation as to whether President Eisenhower would run for reelection—little, if anything, has been said as to whether he should be the candidate again.

Today, I feel it my duty to voice my own personal opinion on this momentous question, involving as it does, not only the welfare of our beloved President, but also the destiny of his beloved Nation. In speaking primarily to my Republican colleagues in this and the other body, I also address my remarks to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, and in all humility to the citizens of this great Nation.

Although my remarks are directed to all those persons, if but one man hears and heeds them, I shall have fulfilled my purpose for what I have to say concerns that one man.

In speaking today as I do, it is as a Republican of deep and abiding faith in the principles and purposes of our great party, but also with a consciousness of its responsibilities to our country. But I do not speak today as a Republican partisan. As a Member of this great legislative body, I speak with confidence that my words will be heard with understanding on both sides of the aisle. I speak as an American citizen with an appreciation for the priceless heritage of freedom, and also with the awareness of the concomitant obligations of those who would enjoy it.

The matter of which I speak, undoubtedly, is upon the conscience of more Americans than have given it expression. It has been upon my own for many months.

I speak in opposition to those who would urge a President of admittedly uncertain health to seek a second term. This I do for many reasons, the principal ones of which are that it is not fair to Dwight Eisenhower to appeal to his sense of duty by urging him to run again; and that it is not for the best interest of the country that he attempt a second term.

Four years ago, under the banner of the Republican Party, an American who had already given a lifetime of service to his country culminating in the commanding generalship of our victorious armies in World War II, again responded to the call of duty and assumed the heaviest burden of leadership in the history of the world.

With full recognition of the great contributions this man had already made to the freedom and security of the Nation and the world, Democrats joined the Republicans to demand a continuance of his service and sought his leadership by placing him in the highest office of the land.

Their call was an unprecedented demonstration of affection and gratitude. It was an expression of boundless confidence that his seasoned hand could hold our ship of state on a steady course through dangers as great as any which ever faced this or any other nation of free men.

This is neither the time nor place to expound on the great service to our country and the world which Dwight Eisenhower has rendered. We are all aware of it, and history will confirm it. Nor do I have the ability to give proper expression to the eternal debt which is owed to him. I can only acknowledge it on behalf of millions of men of all nations, all colors, and all creeds.

As for his service to the United States, it is a sufficient statement to say he has given 41 of his 65 years. He has given it unstintingly, proudly, willingly, industriously, effectively—yes, gloriously.

We have bestowed upon him the highest honor within our power. He has responded to the limit of endurance.

What is the limit of a man's patriotic duty. Does the superior quality of his leadership condemn him forever to its burdens?

Will the Nation not be content with 41 years of a man's life in public service or do we demand all of it?

It is with sorrow and with regret that I contemplate our greed and insatiability. No matter how great a man's service, no matter how much of his life he has given to the public weal, there are those who would demand more.

Already the pressures are being built up to deny Dwight Eisenhower the well-earned right to lay aside the mantle of state with a sense of duty fully done.

My sense of Christian charity prompts me to forgive all those who would take advantage of Dwight Eisenhower's sense of duty in this way, because I am sure they do not do so in selfishness, but in what they conceive to be the best interest of our country. I do not have to defend on the floor of this House my devotion to President Eisenhower. This body well knows the manner in which I have supported his principles and programs. Today, I am again speaking in his behalf.

But I am also speaking in behalf of the Nation. What is the situation we face? The burdens of the Presidency have been described in the past as "killing." In these days of hydrogen weapons, of intercontinental bombers and missiles, can any man foresee these burdens as becoming less onerous?

The high challenges and deep obligations of the Presidency in our times are fully known to Dwight Eisenhower. No man knows better than he the great opportunity for personal service and dutiful patriotism that the Presidency offers, and the wearing demands it places upon him who fills it. No man's life exemplifies better than Eisenhower's a full and complete response to the call of duty, on the battlefield, in the council chambers, and in the highest office of our Government.

I say that if Dwight Eisenhower again becomes a candidate for President, he will be elected, and if he were in full and sound health, I would urge him to run. But I believe that Dwight Eisenhower should not, and will not again become a candidate for public office. He will not because of the very sense of duty that is synonymous with his name. He will transcend the immediate, and, in an ultimate act of patriotism, step down for his country's good.

To ask him to do otherwise is to belie his sense of duty and it is unfair to him personally.

But there is more at stake than our sense of justice and gratitude, and more is involved than our respect for this beloved man. We would be unworthy of his leadership if we failed to consider our country.

My colleagues in the House will acknowledge the need for frankness. They will be quick to acknowledge, too, that the burdens of the Office of the President are greater than those of any Member of this or of the other body, and far greater than those of any other post which mortals are called upon to fill.

And never in our history has the Presidency called for greater reserves of energy, greater reservoirs of patience, and greater capacity for searching analysis and aggressive solution of crushing problems. It is very well to speak of the return to a normal life of those other persons who have suffered heart attacks, but there is nothing normal about the Presidency.

There is nothing normal about the Presidency and there is nothing normal about the times.

I said when I began that I spoke as a Republican but not as a partisan. As a partisan, it would serve the short-term interest of my party to have our great leader once again at the head of the ticket. But as a Republican it would be to substitute expediency for right, politics for principle.

We owe it to Dwight Eisenhower, we owe it to ourselves, and we owe it to our country so to comport ourselves in compassion and understanding that in fulfillment of his highest duty he may relinquish with honor the heavy burdens of his office, and for decades to come continue to live among us, giving of his wisdom, his humanity, and his vision.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this administration has reduced the farmer's price, increased his cost and cut his acreage. The Department of Agriculture has held the products of American farmers off world markets while the United States Government provided funds to increase foreign production of the same commodities.

Our Government has provided hundreds of millions of dollars for tractors, gins and combines, yes and good seeds, for irrigation and for flood control, all to expand foreign production for export. We have granted tax concessions to Americans for foreign investment and held our commodities off world markets in order to give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States is paying the salaries of 740 American agriculturists who are busy teaching foreign countries how to add to world surpluses.

Actually we are giving away commodities the Department would not offer for sale for dollars through normal channels.

Through these giveaway programs we are supplying world needs, until through foreign aid we get foreign production increased to the point United States farmers will never have a foreign market.

No, Mr. Speaker, the President's message does not correct this situation, but rather, he recommends that we take United States land out of production by paying the American farmer this election year. Could it be they will use this cash payment to obtain votes? Could it be they would use this means to get the American farmer to cut back to the point of producing for the American consumer only? That is where the policies of the past few years lead.

The message overlooks many facts if the farmer is to obtain a fair share of the national income.

I would like to present some of the facts which have been largely overlooked:

Present law provides two price systems; First, sales on domestic markets at support level plus reasonable carrying charges; second, sales in world markets at any price.

Discussions of two price systems really have to do with two-level support price, or rather a support price for domestic consumption only.

Modern parity formula divorced supports from costs the farmer pays and now is a percentage of the average price the farmer has received for the past 10 years. Thus increasing costs will not be reflected.

Flexible provisions of present law would lower percentage of modern parity as United States supplies on hand increase. Thus any commodities not sold because the United States would not offer at competitive price would reduce percentage of parity-support level.

Under law governing acreage, reduced exports cut acreage, quantity on hand above normal supply cuts acreage.

Price supports not tied to the cost of what the farmer has to buy are misleading and to a large extent meaningless.

In view of high-concentrate fertilizers, cutting out acreage with no restriction on how much can be grown on the remaining acreage will not substantially cut production.

Cutting United States production will not reduce world supplies—unless United States supplies are kept constantly on the world markets for sale at competitive prices—United States acreage merely moves overseas.

The present program—where the United States is furnishing capital, machinery, fine seed, technical assistance, tax concessions for United States investors abroad, plus holding United States commodities off world markets at competitive prices, thereby holding an umbrella over foreign expansion for export—can only have the effect of wrecking any farm program.

Present programs of making grants, gifts, and sales for foreign currencies in substitution for sales through normal channels cannot retain or regain customers for United States farmers.

This year's proposals must be accepted as an election-year deal—for the same people have sponsored foreign aid to finance increases in foreign production for export. They have tried to eliminate the existing soil-conservation program, for which the Federal Government pays only a third of the cost. They recommended and obtained a change in the parity formula so that it is not longer tied to the cost of what the farmer buys. They refused to offer to sell at truly competitive prices in world trade. They have tried to cut the school-lunch program each year.

A recommendation from this group for a direct payment from the Treasury to the farmer should be taken with tongue in cheek.

If the farmers sell they must accept this billion dollars offered this election year to offset high cost, lower price, and restricted acreage—all of which have been supported by Mr. Benson and these particular farm leaders—the farmers had better get commitments for 1957, 1958, and 1959. Election year payments will run mighty thin when spread over 4 years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois), on account of illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. BOLLING), for this week, on account of official business.

Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. DENTON), for this week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 65. An act to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 637. An act to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Camp Beauregard, and Esler Field, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 792. An act for the relief of Spyros Nikolaou Lekatsas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1352. An act for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1584. An act for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1748. An act to authorize the appointment of Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine, to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1959. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a six and eighty-nine one-hundredths acre tract of land out of a one hundred ninety-nine and nine hundred fifty-nine one-thousandths acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Houston, Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2130. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Beltsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2154. An act for the relief of Lucia Mary Ann Lucchesi Marchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Nickolas Menis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2182. An act for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2364. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2374. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supplies from flood control and river and harbor projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2446. An act to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of cotton that are in excess supply for unrestricted use at current market prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2568. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2591. An act to amend section 602 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2624. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Fort Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution equalizing the salaries of employees in the Senate Press Galleries with those of employees in the House of Representatives Press Galleries; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution to print certain matters in connection with the acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study"; to the Committee on House Administration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, for 45 minutes on Thursday.

Mr. GENTRY, for 30 minutes on Thursday next.

Mr. COLE, for 30 minutes on today.

Mr. GUBSER, for 30 minutes on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. GAVIN in regard to the late Mrs. Vera Buchanan, and that his remarks be included in the permanent RECORD with remarks of other Members concerning Mrs. Buchanan.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GAVIN).

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. MASON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. CRETELLA.

Mr. JOHANSEN.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. DIXON in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 12, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1335. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operation, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat., 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1336. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major and by age group, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid such officers for the period July 1, to December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1337. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to require enlisted members of the Armed Forces to make up time lost during enlistments"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1338. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation entitled "A bill to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1339. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate and regulate holidays for the officers and employees of the Government of the District of Columbia for pay and leave purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1340. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1955; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1341. A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia from January 1, to December 31, 1955, pursuant to title IV, section 401 (c) of an act to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia, approved June 29, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1342. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1343. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit intrusion upon the privacy of Federal juries"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1344. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from interlocutory orders"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1345. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1346. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 19, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Juneau and Douglas Harbors, Alaska, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 286); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1347. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 28th Annual Report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved on May 7, 1928, as amended (22 U. S. C. 278a) (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1348. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 1956, the following bill was reported on January 6, 1956:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7871. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; with amendment (Rept. No. 1633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted January 9, 1956]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7930. A bill authorizing the completion of the initial stage of development for flood control and other purposes in the Russian River Basin, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 8218. A bill to prohibit insurance companies doing insurance business of an interstate character from issuing group health, hospitalization, and accident insurance which may be canceled after a period of 3 years for any reason other than non-payment of premium; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8219. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8220. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 8221. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 8222. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8223. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 8224. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Lincoln-Douglas joint debates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 8225. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8226. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 8227. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide additional Federal support to States and certain non-governmental agencies to enable them to carry out adequate demonstration programs for the vocational rehabilitation of the homebound; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 8228. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude bauxite and on certain calcined bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8229. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that nickel ore concentrates imported into the United States shall be exempt from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 8230. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a new method for determining monthly compensation in computing annuities, and to eliminate all restrictions upon the right of a spouse to receive benefits simultaneously under that act and the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8231. A bill to provide for a 15-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and their survivors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 8232. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to assist landowners and operators to conserve and store water; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 8233. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 8234. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8235. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of United States Code relating to the protection of officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 8236. A bill to provide for comprehensive reports by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to all branches of the Government and the executive agencies thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 8237. A bill to provide for the mutualization of the Federal intermediate credit banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8238. A bill relating to the premiums to be charged for insurance issued by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8239. A bill to require certain agencies of the United States engaged in activities affecting the fiscal policy of the Government to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, with respect to the credit policy of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8240. A bill to provide for reorganizing the insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration, to create a Veterans' Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8241. A bill transferring to the Secretary of Defense the management of certain properties presently classified in the national

industrial reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 8242. A bill to require agencies of the United States engaged in lending operations, or the insuring or guaranteeing of loans, to make certain annual reports to the Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8243. A bill to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8244. A bill relating to the direction and supervision of the comptroller organization of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8245. A bill to provide for improving management and technical personnel in the support activities of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8246. A bill authorizing the Federal Housing Administration to provide for its financing through the issuance of bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8247. A bill relating to the lending activities of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8248. A bill to provide for an experimental flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8249. A bill to establish a national policy with respect to commercial fisheries; to establish the Office of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Commercial Fisheries, and define his functions, powers, and responsibilities; to strengthen the commercial fisheries segment of the national economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 8250. A bill to require conformance with State and Territorial fish and game laws and licensing requirements on Federal lands not subject to such laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 8251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of any pensions thereunder to individuals who have been convicted of espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 8252. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 8253. A bill to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 8254. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 8255. A bill to provide benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for the survivors of certain individuals who died prior to 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 8256. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 8257. A bill to make it a crime to eavesdrop on a Federal jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 8258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by increasing the amount which is exempt from the surtax on corporate taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 8259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively in farm tractors or farm machinery or for other agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 8260. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8261. A bill to increase the funds available for the school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 8262. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to increase acreage allotments for the 1956 crop of cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8263. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8264. A bill to amend section 27-114 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. R. 8265. A bill relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 8266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by increasing the amount which is exempt from the surtax on corporate taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 8267. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 8268. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the 180th anniversary of the fortification of Dorchester Heights, Mass., and the evacuation of Boston, Mass., by the British, to be held in South Boston, Mass., on March 17, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 8269. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 8270. A bill to amend the act providing for Federal aid for State veterans' homes to permit payments to homes not primarily furnishing domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 8271. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 8272. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of certain benefits thereunder to individuals

who are convicted of espionage or subversive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 8273. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as specifically to authorize the organization of Federal central credit unions and to authorize Federal credit unions to invest in the shares of, and become members of, central credit unions organized under such act or other laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 8274. A bill to limit price supports on an individual crop on an individual farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 8275. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8276. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Little Gasparilla Pass, gulf coast, Charlotte County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 8277. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8278. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8279. A bill granting consent of the United States of America to be sued by the Crow Tribe of Indians of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8280. A bill to permit the interment of the last survivor of the Union Army and the last survivor of the Confederate Army within the Gettysburg National Military Park, and to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8281. A bill to reduce the individual income tax by 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8282. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 8283. A bill to create a corporation to restore normal employment in labor surplus areas of group IV classification and produce industrial development in such areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8284. A bill to incorporate the George Washington Boyhood Home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 8285. A bill to establish a national policy with respect to commercial fisheries; to establish the Office of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Commercial Fisheries, and define his functions, powers, and responsibilities; to strengthen the commercial fisheries segment of the national economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 8286. A bill to require conformance with State and Territorial fish and game laws and licensing requirements on Federal lands not subject to such laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 8287. A bill to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Governor of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8288. A bill to establish a national policy with respect to commercial fisheries; to establish the Office of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Commercial Fisheries, and define his functions, powers, and responsibilities; to strengthen the commercial fisheries segment of the national economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8289. A bill to authorize appropriations for the conversion and operation of a merchant vessel and for the construction and installation of an atomic propulsion facility and auxiliary equipment, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8290. A bill to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 8291. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 8292. A bill to provide that urban planning grants may be given to municipalities having a population of less than 50,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 8293. A bill to authorize the construction of a project for improvement of Port Townsend Harbor, Wash., for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8294. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 8295. A bill to provide for an experimental national flood indemnity and reinsurance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 8296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively in farm tractors or farm machinery or for other agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 8297. A bill relating to life insurance taken out to cover estimated liability for the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement for the coordinated operation of the Central Valley project and the flood control features of the multiple purpose Oroville Dam proposed to be constructed by the State of California on the Feather River; and to authorize a monetary contribution for the flood-control accomplishments of the said Oroville Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLFIELD:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a chief special counsel and an assistant special counsel to represent the United States in litigation brought against the United States to recover damages under the so-called Dixon-Yates contract; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for

the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a chief special counsel and an assistant special counsel to represent the United States in litigation brought against the United States to recover damages under the so-called Dixon-Yates contract; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 359. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 360. Resolution to request review of reports on Wickford Harbor, R. I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. Res. 361. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the mass transportation problems confronting the large cities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 8298. A bill for the relief of Westfeldt Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 8299. A bill for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 8300. A bill for the relief of Forest H. Byroade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 8301. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 8302. A bill for the relief of Lester D. DeLumpa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 8303. A bill for the relief of Fong Bick Sem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8304. A bill for the relief of Janina Konsewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 8305. A bill for the relief of Toy Kin San; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8306. A bill for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8307. A bill for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8308. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 8309. A bill for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8310. A bill for the relief of C. W. O. George C. Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8311. A bill for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8312. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Neves da Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8313. A bill for the relief of Tom Pritchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8314. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to George R. Stillson; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8315. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maureen L. Filson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 8316. A bill for the relief of Verulo M. Herrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 8317. A bill for the relief of George W. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 8318. A bill for the relief of A. W. Mussallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 8319. A bill for the relief of Isaias Antoine Elias Khoury, Mary (Marie) Khoury, Henri Antoine Khoury, Alexis Elias Khoury, and Matilde Gladis Khoury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

418. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of residents of Williamsport, Pa., favoring passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

419. Also, petition of residents of Towanda and Bradford County, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

420. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Biddeford-Saco Chamber of Commerce urging Congress to establish promptly import quotas on textiles and apparel adequate to maintain the jobs of Maine and American textile workers and safeguard the billions invested in these industries, and to establish in legislation regarding said import quotas suitable machinery for administration and enforcement as well as specific direction that the imports be equitably distributed between different types of cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

421. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Vera E. Sutherland and others, urging legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Natural Gas Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today it was my privilege to deliver an address before a variety of public-spirited individuals and organizations which have banded together to protect the interests of American consumers of natural gas by advocating defeat of the Fulbright bill.

It is my intention to do everything I can toward the objective of protecting the public interest by carrying on my share in this battle, as I have down through the years, when the predecessor legislation to this bill came up.

I send to the desk the text of the statement which I delivered, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES AVALANCHE OF PUBLIC REACTION TO PROTEST AND KILL NATURAL GAS EXEMPTION BILL—SAYS BOTH PARTIES HAVE TO IMPROVE THEIR POSITION ON ISSUE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican on Senate Judiciary and Foreign Relations Committees, before meeting of consumer-labor-women's-business groups opposed to national gas-exemption bill, Washington, D. C.)

It is a pleasure for me to greet this fine assembly of civic-minded citizens.

I am particularly pleased with the wide variety of groups which you represent, because the task which you have undertaken—the protection of the interests of upward of 29 million American consumers of natural

gas—is one which definitely requires the strongest possible alliance of grassroots Americans in every walk of life.

I am going to talk to you today exclusively about the practical aspects in the battle now looming before us.

OUR PURPOSE TODAY IS TO PLAN FOR BATTLE

I am not going to attempt at this point to make a detailed evaluation of the Fulbright-Harris bill which would basically exempt producers of natural gas from Federal control. There is not time on this occasion for either a detailed legal evaluation or a detailed economic evaluation.

I believe, of course, that you are already familiar with the evil effects of the legislation in its arbitrary nullifying of effective regulation under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and its deliberate overturning of the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case.

Let us therefore use this brief occasion as a public planning session. Planning for what? Planning for the battle to protect the public interest. This is deservedly a factual public session because, unlike our